



Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2963
29 November 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THIRD MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 29 November 1990, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. BAKER

(United States of America)

Members: Canada
China
Colombia
Côte d'Ivoire
Cuba
Ethiopia
Finland
France
Malaysia
Romania
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland
Yemen
Zaire

Mr. CLARK
Mr. QIAN Qichen
Mr. JARAMILLO
Mr. ESSY
Mr. MALMIERCA PEOLI
Mr. DINKA
Mr. PAASIO
Mr. DUMAS
Mr. ABU HASSAN
Mr. NASTASE
Mr. SHEVARDNADZE

Mr. HURD
Mr. AL-ASHTAL
Mr. MUSHOBKWA KALIMBA wa KATANA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61483/A 3515V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAQ AND KUWAIT

The PRESIDENT: I have been informed by the Secretary-General that at this meeting of the Security Council the following members of the Council are represented by their Foreign Ministers: Canada, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Zaire. Côte d'Ivoire and Yemen are represented by their Permanent Representatives to the United Nations. The participation of so many Foreign Ministers of the States members of the Council is testimony, I think, to the significance of this meeting. On behalf of the Council, I would like to express to them deep appreciation for their presence.

Colleagues, your very presence here, for only the fourth time in the Security Council's history that Foreign Ministers have assembled, symbolizes, I think, the seriousness of the present situation. I would like to begin today's discussion with a quotation that I believe aptly sets the context for our discussions today. The quotation is as follows:

"There is no precedent for a people being the victim of such injustice and of being at present threatened by abandonment to an aggressor. Also, there has never before been an example of any government proceeding with the systematic extermination of a nation by barbarous means in violation of the most solemn promises made to all the nations of the Earth that there should be no resort to a war of conquest and that there should not be used against innocent human beings terrible poison and harmful gases."

(The President)

Those words, I think, could well have come from the Emir of Kuwait, but they do not. They were spoken in 1936, not in 1990. They come from Haile Selassie, the leader of Ethiopia, a man who saw his country conquered and occupied, much like Kuwait has been brutalized since 2 August. Sadly, that appeal to the League of Nations fell ultimately upon deaf ears. The League's efforts to redress aggression failed and international disorder and war ensued.

History has now given us another chance. With the cold war behind us, we now have the chance to build the world which was envisioned by the founders of this Organization - by the founders of the United Nations. We have the chance to make this Security Council and this United Nations true instruments for peace and for justice across the globe. We must not let the United Nations go the way of the League of Nations. We must fulfil our common vision of a peaceful and just post-cold-war world.

But if we are to do so, we must meet the threat to international peace created by Saddam Hussein's aggression. And that is why the debate that we are about to begin will, I think, rank as one of the most important in the history of the United Nations. It will surely do much to determine the future of this body.

Our aim today must be to convince Saddam Hussein that the just and humane demands of this Council and of the international community cannot be ignored. If Iraq does not reverse its course peacefully, then other necessary measures, including the use of force, should be authorized. We must put the choice to Saddam Hussein in unmistakable terms.

In accordance with the decisions taken previously on this item, I invite the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations to take a place at the

(The President)

Council table; I invite the Deputy Premier and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Anbari (Iraq) took a place at the Council table; Sheikh Al Sabah (Kuwait) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/21969, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Canada, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. Romania and France have joined as sponsors of that draft resolution.

The first speaker is the Deputy Premier and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait. I welcome His Excellency and invite him to make his statement.

Sheikh AL SABAH (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): In the name of Kuwait, I convey to the Assembly the sincere gratitude of its steadfast people which is now resisting the Iraqi aggression. While we follow closely and hopefully the Council's deliberations, it is indeed our fervent hope that this historic meeting will reflect the true voice of the international community, showing a landmark united stand condemning aggression and demonstrating yet again its resolve to counter it, thus affirming that the future will indeed be ruled by law and that international relations will be based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and international law; on understanding, dialogue and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means.

The Council's voice is a message to the people of Kuwait that the international community stands behind it in its struggle to eliminate oppression, throw off tyranny and strengthen its aspirations to overcome the plight of occupation.

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

In greeting the Council, I express the profound gratitude and appreciation of the Kuwaiti people, its hope that tomorrow will be a better day and that the present suffering will be a lesson to the whole world that force, intransigence, obduracy and aggression are all forms of behaviour that belong to the past and that the international community will no longer tolerate or accept such behaviour.

It gives me pleasure, Mr. President, to express to you, in the name of Kuwait, our sincere acknowledgement of the key role played by the United States during its stewardship of the Security Council in the month of November. On a personal note, let me commend you, Sir, for your laudable effort to underscore the vital role of the Council and its effectiveness as an instrument of preserving - indeed, imposing, if necessary - peace and security in the world. The people of Kuwait expresses its gratitude to you and to your country, which the statement of His Highness, Sheikh Jaber Al Ahmed Al Sabah, the Emir of the State of Kuwait while receiving President Bush in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia a week ago, reflected. I should like to quote a few words from that statement:

"I commend the decisive role played by the United States of America, its people and Government, by facing up to aggression and repelling it. This American stand did not come from a vacuum, because they are the descendants of those trail-blazing immigrants who, centuries ago, preferred to risk and endanger their lives by emigrating to a remote and unknown world rather than submit to oppression and having their freedom shackled. By so doing, they instituted a heritage of countering injustice and aggression. Their hopes to build a free world that rejects humiliation and that refuses to succumb to tyranny were realized, and it has now become a refuge for all freedom lovers. Today, their descendants reflect the historic crossing of their ancestors to

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

dissipate the darkness cast on the land of the free people by the spectres of dictatorship and injustice, in keeping faith with their forefathers' customs and heritage."

I should also like to pay a tribute to the United Kingdom for the important role played during its presidency of the Council last month. In addition, I should like the record to reflect our deep appreciation to the friendly Government of Great Britain, with whom my country has long-standing historical ties, for its brave and just stand on the side of the rights of the Kuwaiti people.

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

I should also like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to all the Foreign Ministers who have taken the trouble to come from far away to attend this meeting in person, thus underlining the importance of this historic session today. The Kuwaiti people is indebted to each and every one of them for it perceives in their presence here an expression of support and solace of its pain and redress of the injustice it suffered.

The Council convenes today to express its resolve that the principles of the United Nations Charter should be concrete facts, that words will be translated into tangible deeds and that the principle of collective security should be the framework that regulates international relations, so that people may rest assured that the stronger will not prey on the weaker and that those who harbour aggressive intentions should hesitate and consider before resorting to force because they now know that the entire world will reverse their aggression and face up to their adventures.

The Security Council meets today under Chapter VII of the Charter which regulates international relations in a way that leaves no room for aggression or acceptance of the use of force and shows no tolerance towards those who breach the principles of the Charter.

In this connection, I should like to pay tribute to those countries which have contributed to the multinational force and thus demonstrated their commitment to the supremacy of the rule of law, to the consolidation of peace and their determination to prove by deed that aggression, arrogance and oppression are forms of behaviour that belong to the Middle Ages and have no place at all in the 1990s.

The multinational force is a concrete translation of the will of the international community that aggression stands to lose and that the use of force avails nothing but destruction.

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

Kuwait participates in today's meeting while fully recognizing that peace means construction while war means destruction, and that prosperity as well as economic and social progress depend on stability.

Kuwait has been the victim of aggression and invasion mainly because it has sought to solve problems through dialogue and understanding. We were confident that force could not be used by another Arab country, by a neighbour with whom we have always had common bonds of brotherhood, neighbourly relations and a common heritage.

Following the brutal Iraqi aggression against Kuwait and its occupation and annexation by military force, this Council meets for the second time at the Foreign Ministers level. This in itself is a highly significant event, an event that reflects the true nature of the aggression that is now being discussed, its implications, dimensions, repercussions and effects on world peace. This aggression has not been limited to the occupation of land. Indeed, from the very first day of the invasion there has been an uninterrupted string of acts of killing, torture, displacement and brutality towards the peaceable Kuwaiti people which rejected occupation and proudly showed no willingness whatsoever to co-operate with the occupiers. On the contrary, the people of Kuwait began to mount resistance by civil disobedience, thus graphically demonstrating its rejection of occupation. This has proved the most effective weapon yet, but the response of the Iraqi aggressor showed no mercy or compassion, indeed no respect for divine or human codes of conduct. Perhaps this explains the havoc wreaked by its forces and the wide-scale destruction they have brought about throughout Kuwait.

The Iraqi troops also denied individual rights and freedoms, destroyed and plundered all types of movable assets, transferring those assets to Iraq in a systematic campaign in order to destroy the economic and social infrastructure of Kuwait.

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

The malicious policies pursued by the aggressor sought to ensure that these crude atrocities would instil terror and alarm that would prompt Kuwaitis by force and coercion to leave their property and assets to be pillaged by these wild beasts. Those forces started to confiscate and burn all identity documents, then transferred large numbers of Iraqis and foreigners to replace the Kuwaitis and settle in their homeland and live in their homes, in a systematic campaign to destroy and transform the demographic composition of Kuwait.

Perhaps in the past two days members of the Security Council have seen for themselves some aspects of the tragedy which my compatriots in Kuwait are living through at this moment, as outlined by the eyewitnesses who have suffered under the oppression of occupation and from its brutal practices.

All that is but a limited sample of the daily practices perpetrated against the people of Kuwait by the usurpers, who have shown total indifference to every value and code of conduct, both Islamic and international. Against all these odds, however, we draw our solace from the conviction that God and right are on our side and from the certainty that the overwhelming international support we have received and the determination to defeat aggression, irrespective of the price, will ensure the restoration of our legitimate rights.

It is true that Kuwait is a small country, both in size and population, but thanks to the massive and overwhelming international support which is being extended to us on the basis that justice is a true shield of peace, we find that Kuwait is indeed a Power that carries significant weight.

Since the Iraqi aggression, the Council, in an unprecedented manner, has adopted 11 resolutions under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter wherein it demanded full, immediate and unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and the restoration of the legitimate Government of Kuwait. Some of those resolutions were aimed at forcing Iraq to comply with the international will by peaceful means

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

through the imposition of a total economic embargo against Iraq, together with other measures. This embargo was but a means to an end and not an end in itself.

Your Council's resolutions were adopted at one and the same time with similar resolutions adopted at the pan-Arab, pan-Islamic level, and within the framework of the Non-Aligned Movement on the same basis as resolutions 660 (1990) and 662 (1990).

In addition to those resolutions, there have been personal initiatives and endeavours undertaken by prominent international and regional personages, including the Secretary-General and envoys from the Soviet Union, China and other countries, which aimed at persuading the Iraqi leadership to respond to the international will. Unfortunately, all those efforts have met a stone wall of Iraqi intransigence, while aggression and occupation continue to shake the very foundations of stability in the region and the people and inhabitants of Kuwait continue to undergo untold suffering.

Efforts in the same vein have also been made by some Arab States whose positions are not totally in line with the Security Council resolutions and who have kept the channels of dialogue with Baghdad open.

Despite all those efforts and good offices, the Iraqi régime persists in its intransigence and obduracy, and rejects all overtures, disdaining all peaceful attempts, thumbing its nose at the world community and shunning the international will.

The Security Council resolutions mean nothing to Iraq, which shows no respect and no sensitivity, renders homeless hundreds of thousands of people of many nationalities, causes havoc in the world order and world economy and plunges the whole region towards a horrible conflict in order to achieve its ambitions and maintain its hegemony and confrontational posture.

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

The atrocities of the Iraqi régime, which has run amok, go far beyond all accepted norms of civilized behaviour as set forth in legal instruments. Having no respect for the human person, for human dignity and rights, it has sought to mete out revenge against some States by detaining their nationals who were present in Kuwait and Iraq, taking them as hostages, and denying them their fundamental freedoms.

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

It has subjected them to torture and intimidation by using some hostages as human shields, held against their will as guests at certain strategic installations. This is perhaps a new form of degrading treatment. Now, the Iraqi régime is using these human beings as bargaining chips, offering to release some of them as a blackmail ploy and as a tactic to divert attention from its aggression against Kuwait.

After all these efforts and all these resolutions and the time that is measured by my people in minutes, as they continue to bleed profusely, no one can really claim now that the international community has not given Iraq the full opportunity to comply with international will or, for that matter, that the world community has not offered good, feasible grounds for a peaceful settlement and the elimination of the prospects for war and saving the region from a real holocaust, the real consequences of which perhaps no one can predict except God the Almighty. Nor can anyone really claim that the international community has ignored any positive signals or really meaningful Iraqi initiatives in response to the Security Council resolutions. Channels of communication with the Iraqi régime are full of good prospects for achieving a just, peaceful settlement. Indeed, there are many formulas and avenues that can lead to peace, but the intransigence of the Iraqi régime is the real reason that is pushing the region at this point to a conflagration that we do not want to see. But it is being imposed upon us, for it now seems to be the only avenue to ensure the restoration of our rights.

The Iraqi régime has sought to deflect attention from its crime against humanity and world peace by invoking issues that have nothing to do with its aggression against Kuwait, such as citing the danger of the foreign presence in the region. Iraq is the first to know that it is the real reason for that presence. It cited the question of hostages in order to create a humanitarian issue without

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

paying due attention to their dignity. Indeed, it dragged them into its adventurous schemes in a desperate attempt to link its aggression against and occupation of Kuwait and the expulsion of the Kuwaiti people to the question of Palestine, which is, alas, the first victim of its aggression. Iraq continues to exploit that question as a cheap propaganda ploy. It calls for an Arab solution, from which it is the first to dissent, while later rejecting and then utilizing that to sow the seeds of dissension into Arab ranks.

Crude exploitation of these questions exposed the tactics of the Iraqi régime to gain time, cause division and play on emotions and sentiments. But, the Arab world, the Islamic world and the international community found out the truth, defined the road, set the goals and demonstrated firm unity and resolve. This is represented in the draft resolution now before the Council.

The message contained in this draft resolution is indeed a message that gives peace a new chance, that would make us skilfully snatch it from the total darkness imposed on our region by the Iraqi régime. Indeed, it is a glimmer of hope that will not dim. It is a torch of light that will guide all of us out of the dark tunnel into which the Iraqi régime has stranded the region. The Iraqi régime has disregarded the appeals by people to comply with the resolutions passed by the Council and has responded to the cries of those who suffer from the harshness of occupation of my country, Kuwait, and its vicious invading forces continue to sabotage every prospect for peace. Therefore, the international community, represented by the Security Council, should now feel free, at this stage, to use all necessary means available to it and in co-operation with my Government, as provided for in the draft resolution, in order to implement the resolutions adopted by the Council so as to put an end to this naked defiance and the inadmissible

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

opposition to the will of the international community, which refuses the use of force or the use of violence as a way of dealing with others.

Our goal is peace. Our Islamic faith advocates peace and enjoins us to work earnestly and sincerely for peace. But, by the same token, true Islam makes it incumbent upon us all to resist aggression and not to yield in submission to the aggressor. Perhaps God the Almighty has defined for us a prescription for fair and just recourse in the face of such an aggression, for God says in the Holy Koran:

"If two parties among the believers fall into a quarrel, make ye peace between them: but if one of them transgresses beyond bounds against the other, then fight ye (all) against the one that transgresses until it complies with the command of God; but if it complies, then make peace between them with justice, and be fair: for God loves those who are fair (and just)."

(The Holy Koran, XLIX:9)

Today's meeting of the Security Council will represent a historic landmark. Your decision today will indeed lay down historic guidelines that will perhaps have an impact on the future of mankind. Therefore, may God the Almighty guide you along the right path and, ultimately, ensure success for your endeavours. Meanwhile, we pray to God the Almighty to inspire those who diverged from the course of righteousness to regain their senses, heed the calls for peace and respond to the voice of justice. Our final prayer is to praise Allah, Lord of the universe.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Kuwait for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations, on whom I now call.

Mr. AL-ANBARI (Iraq): Thank you, Mr. President, for giving me the opportunity to address the Council in the presence of so many distinguished Foreign Ministers.

On 25 October, when the Council was debating the text that became resolution 665 (1990), I addressed the Council. I tried to focus its attention on the legal requirement which the Council must observe in adopting any resolution involving any use of force. Otherwise, I argued, the Council would be acting beyond its jurisdiction, and its action should be deemed null and void. I believe the same argument applies today - and for even a better reason. For under the Charter of the United Nations any use of force is deemed to be an act of aggression, save for three exceptional cases. The first case comes under Article 51 and involves self-defence. Here the use of force is limited to the period until the Security Council is seized of the matter. Beyond that, any use of force must be deemed to be an act of aggression. In the second case, the Security Council can act if sanctions adopted in accordance with Article 41 prove to be ineffective or unenforceable. In such a case the Council can act collectively under Article 42 and can use force in accordance with a mechanism provided for in Article 43.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

In other words, in this case only collective action under the command and control of the Security Council, in co-ordination with the Military Staff Committee, can lead to the use of force against any country, and no individual Member State may be authorized to lynch a particular country for any reason.

The third of the three cases to which I have referred arises under Article 106 of the Charter. When the Security Council fails to reach special agreements with Member countries to have forces of those countries put under Security Council command, the four countries that signed the Moscow Declaration of October 1943, together with France, and in consultation with the Members of the United Nations, can undertake joint action against any country.

Those are the three exclusive cases in which the use of force may legally be authorized by the Security Council. Regrettably, however, the Council apparently thought that in this case the legal requirements were disposable niceties. That is why I shall today focus attention on the political aspect of the dispute.

(spoke in Arabic)

Today the Security Council convenes at this lofty level to vote on a draft resolution that the United States Government has been trying insistently, tirelessly and relentlessly to have the Council adopt, so that the Council may judge Iraq as a State that does not want peace. The implication is that Iraq knows nothing but the use of force. That is a tendentious stance and a deliberate and suspect distortion of the facts.

My Government has advocated peace, and continues to do so. However, what it wants is a comprehensive peace, a comprehensive, durable and just peace that neither adds to nor subtracts from the rights of any party.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

As members of the Council know, an in-depth dialogue has been possible only with two of the permanent members of the Council; the other three permanent members, especially the United States of America, have refused dialogue. The United States of America has imposed an embargo and a blockade upon dialogue and discussion with the Government of my country. Instead, it has chosen to issue orders and demands as if we were a branch of the American Administration. This approach is totally rejected by us because it is a brazen violation of the principle of equality between the countries and peoples of the world and an infringement of the human fundamentals upon which international relations must be based.

This American logic which throttles any initiative for any dialogue that aims at achieving a peaceful settlement on the Arab or international levels, takes its point of departure from American imperialist considerations, which are now more glaringly clear than ever before, especially in our Arab region. This is reaffirmed by the fact that the premises of this policy of the United States, the arguments that it invokes and the objectives that it declares contradict each other. The final outcome is the adoption of double standards in dealing with issues of the same nature, for purposes of pure American interest.

Where then is the new international order of which the United States speaks and to which others refer wittingly or unwittingly? Where then is the quality of "order" if what is required is the application of duplicitous policies, which, by their very nature, do not recognize justice and fair play? Where is the international quality of such an order if the purpose is to impose American hegemony, to make others carry out American orders which aim at safeguarding the political, economic and security interests of the United States, in total disregard of the interests of others? Where is this novel quality of order if the logic of

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

its basic features, beyond the European orbit, is arrogant and brutal power, which leaves no place for dialogue, at a time when the Americans flaunt the so-called achievements in the European area and depict them as if they applied by universal consensus to the entire world, to the whole planet?

As a cover for its aggressive and imperialist policies in the region, the American President alleges that the crisis is not the result of a stand by the United States against Iraq. He claims that it is the world that stands against Iraq in a manner unprecedented in the annals of the United Nations.

Such talk lays bare the fact that small States that do not enjoy veto power in the Security Council and find no one to protect them from the super-Power permanent members are the only countries exposed to sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. Suffice to refer, as an example, to the fact that the United States is the Power that, over many years, forestalled international unanimity and prevented the imposition of sanctions on the Zionist entity for its expansionist and aggressive policies, for the crimes that, since its inception, it has continued to perpetrate against the Palestinians and the Arab people at large.

The current crisis has shown, among other things, that the United States totally dominates the Security Council and its arbitrary and biased procedures. At the same time, it has highlighted the independence of Iraq, the fact that Iraq is a non-aligned State in the true sense, as it does not come under the banner or protection of any of the super-Power permanent members of the Security Council.

Is it by ironic coincidence or by naked premeditation that this meeting of the Council, at this eminent level - a meeting called for, striven for, by the United States of America by all means available to it, a meeting over which it presides - is being held on the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, at a time when the world at large knows that the United States of America is the

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

only Power in the world that has impeded the adoption of just resolutions to safeguard the rights of the Palestinian people and that it is the Power that has prevented implementation of the many decisions adopted by this international organization, especially by the Security Council, in spite of the limited nature of the demands of those resolutions?

Let us recall the objectives declared by the American Administration and the justification for the build-up of its aggressive forces in the Holy Lands of Islam - how they evolved from a claim that Saudi Arabia was being protected from a so-called Iraqi threat, to the declaration that the objective was to safeguard American economic security in the field of energy and job opportunities, and, finally, to the claim that Iraq has acquired nuclear weapons when it became clear to the United States Administration that the objectives which were declared previously did not elicit enough support inside the United States for turning from a defensive to an offensive posture in justifying the military build-up in the region whose aim is to wage war against Iraq. The differing pretexts and objectives of the United States have led one American observer to state:

(spoke in English)

"The idea is to create so much confusion that rational public response is impossible."

(spoke in Arabic)

Our difference with the Security Council in respect of the item under consideration is that we reject this policy because it is malicious, brutal and aggressive.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

The members of the Council are in duty bound to remember how the United States has dealt with the rights of the Palestinian people in the United Nations throughout the long years during which they have been pleading their cause here, and particularly in recent days when the Council has been dealing with the Israeli crimes against the children of the intifadah. That attitude on the part of the United States and its allies is representative of the dilatory manoeuvres being made to impede the adoption of resolutions that would have resolved the matter correctly and protected the Palestinian people. The true objective, of course, is to protect Israel, its crimes and its policy of aggression. In that connection, when this latter subject is before the Council we never hear any mention of the Charter, or international law, or the new world order. The logic of this is that all are equal, but some are more equal than others.

Here, we must ask the question: Why Iraq? We must say it frankly to the Council. Since the adoption of Security Council resolution 660 (1990) on 2 August we have witnessed the further adoption of one hasty decision after another. Our people believe that the Council's resolutions would not have been adopted with such alacrity had it not been for American pressure, pressure in which the American politicians daily take pride to the point that theirs has been the only voice that we hear. Our people are well aware of the fact that some members of this body and in the world Organization are concerned about the manifestations of hegemony within the Security Council purporting to make its resolutions the sole expression of the opinion of the international community as a whole. Some are asking questions about the role of other members of the world Organization who have voted to select those who represent them in this body at a time when they stand helplessly by, unable to uphold the principles of the Charter which are based on dialogue and peaceful

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

settlement and not on beating the drums of war for imperialistic purposes that are completely deviant from the logic of the age.

Our people also wonder how the Security Council can leap to adopt one resolution after another at a time when the Foreign Minister of Iraq is prevented under bare-faced pretexts from presenting his position to the Council before it hands down its judgement. This has entrenched the impression that the Council deals with the causes of the Arab peoples in a special way, based on double standards.

For example, we see how the Council deals with the Israeli usurpation of Palestinian and Arab rights, and it is indeed a painful paradox for the international Organization that the Security Council, which is entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, should be a willing tool in the hands of the American Administration at a time when that very Administration has so far been unable to convince the American Congress itself to agree to the use of force at this stage. President George Bush hopes to exploit the Security Council in order to influence the decision of the Congress and obtain its blessing for the use of force.

Once again, we ask: Where is that new international order? Is it the massing of American forces and their deployment in the Gulf region? Is it the threats of the invasion and destruction of Iraq? Is it the issuing of the ultimatum of a deadline, which is more like a police action than a serious and responsible attempt to resolve the problems of the region? Here, it is appropriate to quote a statement made by a member of the American Congress and an expert in America's wars, Mr. Bob Carey, who commented on the build-up. He said:

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

(spoke in English)

"It is a mistake because it forsakes the potential of a new world order in favour of the tactics of the old order. Rather than relying on diplomacy, co-operation and multilateral regulation of arms flows, we" - that is, the Americans - "will revert primarily to reliance on United States troops and United States arms sales."

(spoke in Arabic)

Iraq calls for peace. Iraq desires peace, not for us alone, but for the entire Middle East region. Iraq advocates such a peace and desires such a peace on the basis of the implementation of all Security Council resolutions, in a just manner and in keeping with a single standard based on justice and fairness. Here, I should like to quote a statement by the dean of American diplomats,

Mr. George Kennan, who stated:

(spoke in English)

"The important thing in thinking about international affairs is not to make moral judgements or apportion blame but to understand the nature of the forces at work as the foundation for thinking about what, if anything, can be done."

(spoke in Arabic)

Iraq has adopted that approach which is embodied in its initiative set forth by Mr. Saddam Hussein, President of Iraq, on 12 August. At that time, he proposed an integrated and comprehensive way of dealing with all the problems of the Middle East through the Security Council and on the basis of international law so as to safeguard the legitimate rights and interests of all the parties and so that the peoples of the region might enjoy peace, stability and prosperity, now and in the future.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

The American Administration rejected that initiative even before examining it, and it imposed its own rejection upon others. The problems of the Middle East are not isolated one from the others. The problems have common historical roots. It is clear that one problem often causes the eruption of other problems, and the situation in the region is also the result of the effects of a chronic problem that remains unsolved. Linkage between the problems in the region is therefore natural and logical. Any attempt to separate them is artificial and disregards the organic historical and political links that bind them all together.

The American refusal to accept that reality is prompted by a suspect motivation that has nothing to do with the interests of the people of the Middle East. It is a premeditated American policy to gain control over the region's fate for purely imperialistic reasons. It is indeed an exercise in political hypocrisy that the American position embodies a contrary, or opposite, linkage with the problems of the Middle East, since it calls for separation while at the same time continuing to procrastinate and to avoid any resolution of the Palestinian problem, in spite of the fact that Palestinian blood is being shed every day and that the Israeli crimes of occupation, annexation and savage repression continue unabated.

Is this because we are Arabs? Is it because the problems of the Middle East cannot be resolved by one single standard, the standard of international law and the United Nations Charter that the United States allegedly espouses? In spite of the fact that the Council has not given what we have said the attention it merits, the Council must realize that we are not the ones who are attempting to divert attention from other questions for tactical purposes.

To get to the crux of the matter - which is supported by the Arab masses and by many other countries from outside the region, I would offer one example of support for our viewpoint that we have recently received. I refer to a statement

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

by the National Council of Churches in the United States, an organization that represents 42 million American citizens. In mid-November, that body stressed the need to hold an international conference to deal with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and accused the American Administration of duplicity and hypocrisy for calling for the withdrawal of Iraqi forces under Security Council resolutions, in total disregard of the need to demand the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories in the West Bank, Al-Quds, the Sinai, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

In its statement, the National Council of Churches reaffirmed that
(spoke in English)

"The region cries out for a United States policy that seeks to redress all causes of injustice, including those of Israel and Palestine, Lebanon and Cyprus".

(spoke in Arabic)

This is the question that must be posed now: Will the Security Council measure up to the responsibility of establishing a comprehensive, just and lasting peace through an integrated approach which deals with all the problems of the region? That is the historic responsibility of the Council.

For our part, we are continuing on our road. Peace is our goal. We are working for it; we desire it.

If the United States imposes war upon us, then that will be our destiny, and I assure you that our people will not kneel down and will measure up to its responsibilities, for it is demanding its right and defending that right against injustice and tyranny.

The PRESIDENT: It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the case.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

Before putting the draft resolution to the vote, I shall call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Yemen): It gives me great pleasure, Mr. President, to convey to you the greetings of His Excellency Mr. Abdul-Kareem Al-Iriani, the Foreign Minister of Yemen, who unfortunately could not participate in this historic meeting of the Security Council. May I on this occasion express the satisfaction

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

of my delegation at seeing you, the Secretary of State of the United States, presiding over the proceedings at this important meeting.

It happens that today is the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People - a stark reminder of the plight of a people that has been systematically denied its basic right to national self-determination. There is in the Middle East region another crisis that is not being dealt with by the same standard as the Security Council has been applying to the crisis in the Gulf. What is at stake is not only the fate of the Palestinians, a displaced and tortured people, but the credibility of the Security Council.

At the conclusion of the Paris summit last week a momentous declaration marked the end of the cold war, an era in contemporary history characterized mainly by ideological and military confrontation between the two competing Power blocs. We are now being told that a new world order is on the horizon, a world order in which law is paramount and freedom supreme. Today, however, we are not meeting here to celebrate the end of one era and the beginning of another. Nor are we here to lay down a framework for the new world order, an evolving process that will nevertheless be influenced by our decision. We are here today to face the first serious challenge of the post-cold-war era: the crisis in the Gulf.

Since the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, on 2 August, the Security Council has adopted 10 resolutions, calling for the complete withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, the immediate release of all hostages and the restoration of the legitimate Government of Kuwait. In order to ensure the implementation of its resolutions, the Security Council has imposed on Iraq the most sweeping and enforceable sanctions régime. Today the Security Council has before it a draft resolution in effect authorizing States to use force in order to ensure compliance with those resolutions. In the annals of the United Nations this will long be remembered as the "war resolution".

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

Ever since the eruption of the crisis in the Gulf the position of Yemen has been consistent and clear, although at times it has been intentionally distorted. From the very outset Yemen declared that it would take a neutral stand on the conflict in order to be able to contribute to the search for a peaceful Arab solution to that conflict. Yemen also supported Security Council resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and for the immediate release of all hostages, as well as for the restoration of the legitimate Government of Kuwait. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that the Republic of Yemen cannot support a draft resolution that would authorize States to use force, for the following specific reasons.

First, the draft resolution before us does not exclude the use of force and is so broad and vague that it is not limited to the purpose of enforcing implementation of the 10 resolutions on the Gulf crisis adopted by the Security Council. Hence, it will be up to those States with military forces in the area to decide on the prerequisites for the restoration of international peace and security in the region, which might well lead to a military confrontation on a larger scale.

Secondly, the draft resolution before us is not related to a specific article of Chapter VII of the Charter; hence the Security Council will have no control over those forces, which will fly their own national flags. Furthermore the command of those forces will have nothing to do with the United Nations, although their actions will have been authorized by the Security Council. It is a classic example of authority without accountability.

The Republic of Yemen advocates a positive, peaceful approach to resolving the crisis in the Gulf, in accordance with relevant resolutions of the Security Council. Accordingly, I should like to underline the following. The sanctions régime which the Security Council has imposed on Iraq actually has no parallel in the history of the United Nations. Never before has such a comprehensive and

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

sweeping sanctions régime been imposed on any country. One can easily assert that for all practical purposes Iraq is completely isolated from the outside world. For a country that is almost land-locked and can neither export anything, including oil, nor import anything, including foodstuffs, it will not take long, in our opinion, for the sanctions to hurt badly and eventually force Iraq to comply and withdraw from Kuwait.

Furthermore, the sanctions imposed on Iraq, unlike those that the Security Council applied earlier in the case of Southern Rhodesia, are actually being legally enforced by the presence of so many foreign ships and aircraft. It is not being reported in the press, but many Iraqi and foreign ships sailing to and from Iraqi and Kuwaiti ports are being stopped and searched on the high seas or at nearby ports in order to ascertain that no violations of the sanctions are taking place. As a matter of fact, the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) to oversee the strict implementation of the sanctions régime has not to date reported any violations of the sanctions. It is a sanctions régime that is almost totally airtight.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

It is a little surprising that those who used to lecture us on the need to be patient for sanctions to work when they had to do with Rhodesia or South Africa are today in such a hurry to declare that those comprehensive and enforceable sanctions imposed on Iraq are simply not working. For sanctions to work and force Iraq to implement resolutions of the Security Council we need patience. That is the alternative to a catastrophic and unpredictable military confrontation in an inflammable region of the world. But it looks like patience is a rare commodity these days.

In addition to a strict sanctions régime, a peaceful approach to the crisis should, by necessity, involve active diplomatic engagement. Commenting on the crisis in the Gulf, a very wise man said that there were too many war scenarios, but not one peace scenario. Indeed, some impatient warriors are so terrified by the prospects of peace that they would do anything to scuttle a peace proposal and pay anything to ignite the flames of war. Is it not a little strange that the Security Council has not for a long time come up with one resolution that would give the Secretary-General a free hand and clearly mandate him to engage in mediation efforts in order to resolve the crisis peacefully? It is true that Iraqi reaction to resolutions of the Council is not positive, nor is Iraq's response to certain initiatives encouraging. But serious diplomatic negotiations cannot be conducted openly.

Iraq has already expressed its willingness to talk and negotiate with the United States of America. Is it not time to engage Iraq in a serious dialogue? Moreover, we hear from time to time certain constructive suggestions and initiatives that are put forward by leading figures in our own region. Should we not encourage those silent moves, which are very much like feelers?

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

It is ironic that those States which have for years been lecturing us in the Arab world about the virtues of dialogue and diplomatic negotiation are now the ones who are saying no to peace initiatives and peace plans.

Less than three months before the crisis in the Gulf, North and South Yemen peacefully and democratically merged into a unitary State, the Republic of Yemen. For our country, which is situated in the southern part of the Arabian peninsula, the crisis in the northern part of the peninsula is not a distant affair. Even before the eruption of war, Yemen is paying a high price for its insistence on a policy of neutrality and its determination to pursue a peaceful approach to the crisis. To start with, our economy has been dealt a severe blow as a consequence of our compliance with the sanctions régime and of the disruption of economic relations between Yemen and both Iraq and Kuwait, particularly in activities related to oil and refining. Moreover, around 900,000 Yemeni immigrant workers suddenly became casualties of the crisis in the Gulf when their residence in our neighbour country Saudi Arabia was suspended due to new regulations. Because they had only a month to leave the country, many of them had to sell their property at distress prices in order to meet the deadline. Comparatively speaking, it is like having 30 million jobless Americans come back home within a short period, two months. You can imagine the economic strains that will be caused by this demographic dislocation. For Yemen, therefore, there is no alternative to peace, without which our region would be heading towards disaster.

It is a coincidence that the crisis in the Gulf erupted as the post-cold-war era was beginning to take shape. The way in which this crisis will be resolved will therefore definitely affect the nature and future of international economic and political relations. The war option would deprive humanity of a historic opportunity to make a smooth transition to a new world order, one that is not characterized by the military victory of one country or group of countries over

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

others. By causing severe economic disruption and recession, a military confrontation would undermine the evolving process of democratization in many parts of the world, including in my own country, which is committed to genuine democratic reforms. That is why we sincerely hope that peace will prevail in our region and the world at large. Let us give peace a chance.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Permanent Representative of Yemen to the United Nations for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. JARAMILLO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): First, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your holding the presidency of the Council today, as a representative of the United States of America, at this critical meeting. We are sure that your recognized qualities as a successful leader and diplomat will ensure the success of this stage of our deliberations, which are crucial for peace in the world.

In the last two years, the international community has noted with pleasure fundamental changes that have taken place in the context of international relations, opening up a new world political order. The positions of hegemonic blocs that prevailed at the end of the Second World War and the beginning of bi-polar confrontation gave way to what seemed to be a return to reason, justice, universal understanding and peace. Colombia welcomed that spirit of renewal and looked forward to a new climate and to the strengthening of a peace that remained fragile but was in the process of consolidation, and it hoped that every effort would be made to find solutions through economic growth and social justice for the peoples of the developing world. We still envision that major task as being the basic dream of our peoples and the major challenge of industrialized countries.

(Mr. Jaramillo, Colombia)

Today, that encouraging era of peace and development is being endangered as a result of the brutal invasion that took place on 2 August this year. The Security Council has undertaken many efforts since then to restore order and normalcy, but its appeals have not been heeded by the transgressor of law. Colombia still hopes that we may prevail in the struggle to defend life, freedom, independence and human values at all times. That is why the Security Council and the United Nations exist. That is why the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraq and the establishment of an independent Government are requirements that must be met in accordance with the repeated and unanimous demands of the members of the Security Council.

We are firmly convinced that situations such as this are in part a result of the ambivalent and selective language that prevailed in the Council for over four decades. During that time, the power of the veto was used for political considerations, disregarding international law and order in situations in which world peace was breached. A position in keeping with the common interest of all and not the particular positions of any country or group of countries in the Security Council would have prevented reckless actions such as we are faced with today. Since the establishment of the Organization, Colombia has emphasized the negative effects of a discriminatory veto, as is demonstrated by the fact that it was one of the only two countries that opposed the establishment of the veto at the San Francisco meeting.

(Mr. Jaramillo, Colombia)

At the third session of the General Assembly, in 1949, the Head of the Colombian delegation stated,

"Colombia, I repeat, has always refused to vote in favour of the rule of unanimity and has fought to limit the use of the veto." (A/PV.195)

We view with satisfaction and optimism the unanimous steps being taken by the five permanent members of the Security Council with regard to the situation in the Persian Gulf. We hope that this climate of understanding will be maintained and will serve as a basis for the decisions that the Security Council may have to take in the future so as not to have its credibility and effectiveness tarnished through use of a double standard in considering its items.

Colombia has submitted various working papers to members of the Council for consideration, all aimed at promoting a peaceful settlement of the conflict. In that spirit we consider that there are two ways to achieve Iraq's withdrawal: through the use of force or by convincing President Saddam Hussein that he should withdraw voluntarily. If what we wish is to convince him of the latter course, we must ensure that he, as well as Iraq, will conclude that it is better to meet our demands than to reject them.

It is the responsibility of the Security Council, in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter, not merely to threaten Iraq and hope for the best, but rather to take positive action towards achieving a peaceful settlement. If today we are opening the way for the option of using force, let us do so also for the peace option. The best hope of reaching a peaceful solution lies in creating a framework for negotiations.

In developing this idea we must state clearly what will be the future of the economic sanctions, of procedures for settling the financial claims and territorial disputes, and what procedure will be followed in guaranteeing regional peace and

(Mr. Jaramillo, Colombia)

stability. Clarifying these issues could facilitate compliance with Security Council resolutions without in any way rewarding the invader for his action. All these would be in keeping with the spirit that the aggressor should not receive anything other than what would have been guaranteed him through strict application of the rules of international law.

Colombia wishes especially to request the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, to make preferential and continuous use of his good offices with a view to promoting a peaceful settlement of the conflict. His intelligence, quiet strength, resolve and proven experience lead us to hope that peace can be obtained in the Gulf region.

In recent months Colombia has been working to achieve our common goals and we will continue to do so. As the countdown begins towards 15 January, we will step up our efforts to promote a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

The draft resolution we have before us today is, in our view, one more effort by the international community to achieve compliance with decisions adopted by the Security Council. With this draft resolution it is clearly expressing its interest in allowing Iraq one last opportunity to react and withdraw its troops peacefully from Kuwaiti territory. This pause of good will must not be misinterpreted by President Saddam Hussein, since the members of the Security Council, in authorizing Member States to use all necessary means, are expressing a clear position which, if ignored, would place full responsibility for ensuing developments on the Iraqi authorities.

In the hope that reason will prevail over any other consideration and that the hand of God will guide the decisions of those present here, we wish to announce that we will vote in favour of the draft resolution that is before us.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for External Relations of Colombia for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. MUSHOBEKWA KALIMBA wa KATANA (Zaire) (interpretation from French):

Familiar as I am, Sir, with your qualities as an enlightened statesman and experienced diplomat, I must convey to you my congratulations on your country's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month of November 1990. I also take this opportunity to convey my appreciation to the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the competence and determination which marked his presidency in October.

The spirit of co-operation that you have maintained recently among Ministers whose countries are members of the Security Council deserves special mention since the cohesive atmosphere it has produced has enabled members of the Council to act with greater unity.

For the second time in succession a ministerial meeting of the Security Council has been convened to discuss the situation between Iraq and Kuwait following the invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi forces and the avowed intention of the Iraqi authorities to perpetuate their occupation of Kuwait and turn that State, a Member of our Organization, into a mere province of Iraq.

In defiance of the principle laid down in Article 2 of the Charter, whereby all Members of the Organization are called upon to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered, Iraq - on the strength of its military superiority over Kuwait and its arsenal of sophisticated weapons, which it has been perfecting throughout recent years in the course of its war against Iran - has persisted in defying the decisions and resolutions of the Security Council calling on it to withdraw its forces of occupation peacefully from Kuwait.

Since 2 August 1990, the date of the occupation of Kuwait, when immediately beforehand negotiations had been under way between the Iraqi and Kuwaiti

(Mr. Mushobekwa Kalimba wa Katana,
Zaire)

authorities in Jeddah with a view to bringing about a peaceful settlement of the financial dispute between the two countries, the Security Council has adopted 10 resolutions designed to remind Iraq of its responsibilities under the Charter of our Organization as a Member State and called upon it, through the messages of peace which those resolutions constituted, to abide by the provisions of the Charter which require that Members of the Organization refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or behave in any other manner incompatible with the goals of the United Nations.

Having violated the rules of international law by infringing the territorial integrity and destroying the political independence of Kuwait, a Member of our Organization and of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, Iraq must consequently restore to Kuwait its independence and territorial integrity.

Instead of following the path of reason and complying with the rules of international law, Iraq has striven to strengthen its occupation by adopting a series of measures ranging from the annexation of Kuwait to the deployment of its troops, units of which have been reinforced, and extending to tortures, atrocities, and harassment of all kinds inflicted upon Kuwaitis, not to mention the taking of foreign hostages and the violation of the diplomatic immunities of duly accredited diplomats.

(Mr. Mushobekwa Kalimba wa Katana,
Zaire)

Despite many goodwill missions which have gone to Baghdad to try to change the Iraqi position on the invasion and to persuade Iraq to restore independence to the people of Kuwait, the only response from the Iraqi authorities has been disdain and arrogance. The selective freeing of a few hostages highlights the cynicism that permeates the thought processes of those authorities. As a non-aligned country, Zaire deplores this obscurantist attitude on the part of Iraq, a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, which is deliberately exposing its people to the holocaust that could result from a confrontation between that country, on its own, and a heavily armed multinational force made up of many countries.

Iraq should remember the commitment it entered into on 24 April 1955 in Bandung, when it signed the Final Communiqué of the Asian-African Conference, which reaffirmed the fundamental principles of human rights, self-determination and the promotion of peace and co-operation in the world, on the basis of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations, recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations, large and small, and abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Iraq was among the 24 countries of the third world at the time which ardently championed the principle of settling all international disputes by such peaceful means as negotiations, consultations, arbitration or judicial decision, or by other means that the parties might agree upon in conformity with the United Nations Charter, as laid down in paragraph 8 of section G of the Final Communiqué of the Asian-African Conference in Bandung.

The State of Kuwait, the victim of the invasion we are debating, did not take part in that important first Conference of third-world countries, which began the liberation struggle of all the peoples of the world, a struggle that has today resulted in the almost total elimination of colonialism from our planet.

(Mr. Mushobekwa Kalimba wa Katana,
Zaire)

Can it be that a country that was colonized, and that denounced and fought against colonialism, is today committing the same errors as those that were committed in the past, by enslaving the people of Kuwait and subjecting them to a new domination and a disturbing recolonization? Those who want the current of history with regard to decolonization to flow irreversibly will be disappointed by the invasion of Kuwait, a political event that incontestably goes against that current.

It is my privilege and duty once again to make a friendly, brotherly appeal to the Iraqi authorities to think again and recognize that the future and interests of the Iraqi people really lie in peace and the promotion of relations of co-operation, not only with an independent neighbouring Kuwait but also with all countries of the world that cherish peace and justice. For a war, whether long or short, could only bring devastation, destruction and the annihilation of all the cultural and moral values that the Iraqi people hold dear.

My delegation still hopes that this appeal will be heeded and that the occupation forces in Kuwait will be peacefully withdrawn before the deadline laid down in the draft resolution.

The international community and the members of the Security Council, motivated by the purposes of the Charter and responsible for maintaining international peace and security, while guaranteeing the political independence and territorial integrity of Member States of our Organization, cannot tolerate this affront by a single Member State of the United Nations.

Aware of its historic responsibilities to humanity, the Security Council could not envisage other measures against Iraq without giving it a reasonable pause for

(Mr. Mushobekwa Kalimba wa Katana,
Zaire)

reflection after four months of refusal to withdraw from Kuwait. The Council has therefore felt that it should be granted an additional delay of at least 45 days so that it may comply with the 10 resolutions adopted by the Council so far and restore to Kuwait its independence and territorial integrity.

It is in this context that we must view the current initiative by the Security Council, which would authorize all Member States co-operating closely with the Government of Kuwait to use all necessary and possible means to implement resolution 560 (1990) and to restore international peace and security in the area, unless by 15 January 1991 Iraq has withdrawn all its forces from Kuwait. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution.

Those are my delegation's views on the item under discussion.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Commissioner of State for Foreign Affairs of Zaire for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. DINKA (Ethiopia): I should like to join previous speakers in expressing pleasure at seeing you, Sir, presiding over this session, which marks another important turning point in the Council's consideration of the situation between Iraq and Kuwait. I also wish to seize this opportunity to assure you of my delegation's full co-operation in the discharge of your heavy responsibilities at this important meeting of the Council.

In another era, at another place, nations of the world met to deliberate upon a blatant act of aggression perpetrated by an expansionist State against a weak and defenceless people. The time was 55 years ago and that defenceless people was none other than my own, the Ethiopian people, which had to appeal to the League of Nations to apply its own principles and take a stand against the aggression.

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

Historical records clearly show the serious failure of the League of Nations to act in defence of its own Covenant, thus letting brute force triumph, however briefly, over morality and legality. With the benefit of hindsight, it is often asserted, perhaps rightly, that had the League of Nations acted more forcefully and in unison at that critical time in defence of international legality the course of history would have been different, and very probably the world could have been spared the destruction and terrible tragedy of the Second World War.

So, when Iraq launched its naked, unprovoked aggression against small Kuwait, we in Ethiopia saw clearly the danger of history repeating itself, and were easily able to relate the plight of the Kuwaiti people to that faced by us in 1935. That the Ethiopian Government acted promptly in condemning that blatant aggression and in supporting collective action in this Council, therefore, was in no small measure due to the fact that it was a reflection of our own historical experience. It was also meant to signal that in the 1990s the international community must not repeat the mistakes of the 1930s.

Almost four months have elapsed since the invasion of Kuwait. During these four months numerous diplomatic efforts have been made to resolve the crisis peacefully. However, the peaceful measures taken so far, including economic sanctions, have not produced the desired results, for the occupation of Kuwait still continues. Indeed, the various resolutions adopted so far do not appear to have convinced Iraq of the seriousness and determination of the international community, which has waited patiently to see the return of the Gulf situation to the status quo ante.

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

Although the patience of the world community is running out and hopes for a peaceful resolution of the crisis are diminishing, the Council, in reaffirmation of its objective of settling the problem peacefully, is once again meeting today to adopt a resolution and provide Iraq with one more chance to mend its ways and respect the will of the international community.

Many have argued - and with good intentions, I must say - that the international community must wait still longer before considering additional measures. But we have learned from experience that economic sanctions can have an effect only with the passage of time, and that even that can be achieved only with complete, universal compliance. More important, the people of Kuwait rightfully demand the immediate restoration of their sovereignty. We must not, therefore, wait much longer, for justice delayed - as is so often said - could very well be justice denied. We owe it not only to the Kuwaiti people but also to ourselves to live up to our commitment to help to end the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq, and thereby fulfil our obligations vis-à-vis the preservation of international peace and security.

Ethiopia, as all members know, is located not far from the Arabian peninsula and the Persian Gulf, and, as a result, is seriously concerned both about the current crisis and about its long-term impact. We believe that it would not be too early to start thinking about a post-Iraqi withdrawal scenario leading to the establishment of durable stability, peace and security in the region, in order to obviate the possibility of hegemonistic régimes again trying to threaten their peaceful neighbours, particularly small and weak ones. We must also reaffirm and strengthen our determination to work towards lasting peace and stability in the entire region.

(Mr. Dinka, Ethiopia)

My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution before the Council to underscore our determination that aggression should be thwarted and not rewarded. It goes without saying that it is our earnest hope that the Iraqi leadership will heed the force of reason and sanity and make good use of the window of opportunity that it is being offered by the Security Council to comply with the overwhelming collective will of the international community and withdraw from Kuwait within the time-frame provided for in this draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia for his kind words.

Mr. MALMIERCA PEOLI (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, Sir, I wish to greet you on the occasion of your assumption of the presidency of this important meeting of the Security Council. We hope that under your leadership the Council will work effectively to preserve mankind from the scourge of war.

We also wish to extend greetings to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the States members of the Security Council who have come to New York as proof of the fact that we must redouble our efforts to achieve the just solution we all desire.

We were told that this meeting at the Foreign Ministers level, and the draft resolution that would be proposed at it, would be aimed at enhancing the opportunities for a peaceful resolution of the crisis. Hence, we gladly accepted the invitation we received to participate in it.

In recent weeks the Cuban delegation to the Council, together with those of Malaysia and Yemen, have been working on the Colombian initiative with a view to achieving, rather than a draft resolution on a peaceful settlement of the conflict, the very bases that could initiate such a settlement. The Council is aware of the many consultations that these four countries have been holding within and outside the Council in the hopeful and tenacious search for the necessary solution. We shall continue along that path.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

At the same time, our Government - which from the beginning of the conflict appealed not only to the President of Iraq but also to all the Arab Heads of State and to other countries, to the Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and to this Organization to work for an expeditious solution to the conflict - sent a Vice-President of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba as a special envoy to Iraq just two weeks ago, carrying a message for President Saddam Hussein. That message had the very same intention of contributing to a political solution to the conflict.

Before that, our country had been quietly making numerous efforts designed to get Iraq to correct its positions and make them more flexible. At all times - ever since the crisis began - we have been betting on peace and not on war. We are convinced that more than once the Security Council has allowed itself to be drawn into hasty decisions which did not make the path to peace any easier.

Iraq's invasion and annexation of Kuwait is unacceptable and must be condemned. In addition, for the non-aligned nations and countries of the third world it constitutes a regrettable and harmful act because it weakens the unity and solidarity we sorely need to face the challenge of overcoming underdevelopment and gaining a dignified place for the two thirds of the people of this planet who are so much in need of the resources squandered through the arms race and fratricidal wars.

The use of innocent persons as hostages is also reprehensible, and we have strongly condemned it in the Council. On the other hand, it is a real fact that the Security Council, by adopting a resolution for a total blockade, which did not except foodstuffs or medicines, turned millions of elderly people, women and children, who are no less innocent, into hostages of hunger and death. There are already children and sick people among the Iraqi population who have died as a

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

result of the lack of medicines in the hospitals. The presence of more than 200 Cuban doctors and nurses who have been giving their services free of charge in that country for more than 12 years enables us to testify to that fact. Such measures, among others, are not conducive to a solution of the situation that has been created, but rather they promote more intransigence or inflexibility.

Our clear position of principle with respect to each of the proposed resolutions leaves no room for doubt. We have supported those resolutions that we considered just and unquestionable. We have abstained or voted against those that in our view hindered the attainment of a peaceful solution or inexorably could lead to war.

We have also expressed our concern here over the enormous and increasing concentration of military forces from the United States of America and its allies in the Gulf, and over the danger of the outbreak of a war which, even if conventional, would bring enormous destruction to the countries of the region, starting with Kuwait and Iraq and their neighbours, in addition to the losses that would be suffered by the attacking forces. The destruction of the oilfields and facilities concentrated in the region and the resulting shortage of crude oil and its exponential price increases would affect the oil-consuming industrialized countries, but mainly it would affect the non-oil-producing countries of the third world. They would have to add soaring figures to the already high oil prices, on top of the already suffocating external debt and brutally unequal terms of trade.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

We have on previous occasions pointed out here the contrast between the attitude of the Council towards the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and, to mention just two examples, towards the United States invasion of Panama not long ago and the situation in Palestine and the Arab territories, under occupation for 23 years now. The answer we have been given in this Chamber is that these are things that belong in the past, to the cold war era, which has ceased to exist; that we are at a new stage, in which the Charter of the United Nations will be respected by all; and that Iraq's action is an attack against the new world order being born of the best in the post-war spirit.

The reality is that it has not even been possible for this body to send a representative of the Secretary-General to the occupied territories, nor can it provide even the minimum guarantees to the Palestinian youth being murdered daily in the very land of which they have been so cruelly dispossessed.

Leaving aside moral, legal and historical considerations, Cuba has not attempted - it does not consider it realistic in the present situation - to establish any linkage between an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and the Arab territories occupied by Israel. However, is it not scandalously incongruous to invoke norms for some that we ignore for others? Is this not the very same Council that has been holding consultations these past few days on another draft resolution, which said the minimum, was moderate and exclusively humanitarian, on the subject of Palestine, also drafted by Colombia, Malaysia, Yemen and Cuba? Yet the President of the Council ignored the request to convene this body, bypassing the established rules and procedures. Can it be that the long-suffering Palestinian people is even now, in this new, post-cold-war era, not considered worthy of the treatment meted out to other peoples? Can it be that, like the

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

Lebanese, they can have used against them all the terror and brutality of the sophisticated military might of a strategic ally of the United States, without shocking those who say they are shocked by other actions that equally violate international laws and norms?

If we are indeed at the beginning of a new era, if it is our intention that international law shall prevail rather than strategic or geopolitical considerations, if we are interested in justice and not hegemony or control over the world's greatest wealth of oil, then now is the time to work together for a new world order in keeping with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations - which we have in sovereignty accepted - so that there is real equality and justice for all. It would be better still if the United Nations itself were to democratize and abandon norms and practices of privilege, adopted almost half a century ago, that are incompatible with today's world and deny the great majority of States of the international community full exercise of their prerogatives and faculties.

We understand that the various problems mankind faces today cannot be resolved all at once; however, when there is a real willingness, adequate solutions can be found. Dialogue and negotiation have proved themselves to be the best instruments available to the United Nations and its Member States for the resolution of conflicts.

Namibia is an encouraging example of the many difficulties which can be overcome at the negotiating table by parties in dispute. In contrast, the case of Korea is an example of how the use of force under the flag of the United Nations can, after three years of war, hundreds of thousands of victims and enormous material destruction, end in an armistice which keeps that country divided as it was before the conflict broke out, and with foreign military bases and tens of thousands of soldiers in the southern part of the territory.

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

Cuba believes that it would not be advisable to adopt a resolution which is a virtual declaration of war, a fixed-term ultimatum before hostilities are launched, and is equivalent to giving the United States and its allies carte blanche to use their enormous sophisticated military capability. If that is how the crisis is to be resolved, there can be no denying that the procedure is uncivilized to say the least and it will cause the international community enormous frustration and show that the United Nations and the principal statesmen of today's world are unable to solve problems politically and peacefully.

The text before us moreover violates the Charter of the United Nations by authorizing some States to use military force in total disregard of the procedures established by the Charter.

We would have favoured a firm resolution aimed at ensuring respect for the will of the international community, and at the same time being generous and magnanimous, a resolution that rectified the decision to prevent food and medicine reaching children, women and old people in Iraq. This would have indeed given great moral authority to the United Nations, lending force to its demand that the Iraqi troops withdraw from Kuwait, that Kuwait's sovereign rights be restored and that all hostages be released immediately.

Instead, we are being asked to support a deadline for war, in an attempt to meet the inflexibility and intransigence of the Government of Iraq with inflexibility and intransigence and most extreme measures by the Security Council. It is the duty of the United Nations to respond wisely to any manifestation of contempt or extremism, not to profess a fanatical belief in the use of force.

It has become apparent that force has not brought us closer to a solution but has, on the contrary, encouraged rigidity in Iraq's positions. The political trade and financial measures that have been taken are more than adequate. Today, Iraq cannot receive by air, land or sea goods which, in addition to food and medicine,

(Mr. Malmierca Peoli, Cuba)

are essential to the life of a nation. It is obvious that no State could long withstand the political and economic isolation imposed on that country, without there being any need to starve women, children and old people or to wage bloody and destructive war.

This is an event unique in history. From the moment this draft resolution is adopted, the people of the world will, for over six weeks, be like the audience in an enormous stadium waiting for the outbreak of war. To paraphrase the title of a famous novel by Gabriel Garcia Marquez, this resolution being put before us could be called "The Chronicle of an Announced War". This is the one and only way this text submitted to us can be interpreted.

No one can escape the reality that the unleashing today, with the announced authorization of the Security Council, of unwanted conflict would be the worst expression of the equivocal role the United Nations could assume in future if it follows this path. Cuba is not willing to assume that historical responsibility.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister of External Relations of Cuba for his welcome of our accession to the presidency of the Council.

Mr. QIAN Qichen (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Mr. President, allow me at the outset to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of this important Security Council meeting at the Foreign Ministers level. Your diplomatic skill and experience are well known.

Almost four months have passed since the Iraqi invasion and annexation of Kuwait. The international community has made all kinds of efforts to settle the Gulf crisis, and the Security Council has adopted 10 successive resolutions in this regard. Regrettably, however, Iraq refuses to implement these resolutions and has not even indicated that it will withdraw its troops from Kuwait. The Gulf situation is becoming more and more tense and the danger of war is increasing daily. The Chinese Government feels deeply worried and anxious about this. In order to know the views of various parties concerned on the settlement of the Gulf crisis and to explore possibilities for a peaceful solution to the crisis, I paid working visits, from 6 to 12 November, to some countries in this region. I personally conveyed to the Iraqi leaders, in all earnestness, the international community's demand that they should withdraw from Kuwait immediately, and expounded to them the solemn positions of the Chinese Government. As a result of my visits, I feel deeply that members of the international community share common ground on the Gulf crisis on two points, namely, they all oppose the Iraqi invasion and annexation of Kuwait and call on Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait immediately, while at the same time they all wish to see the Gulf crisis settled through peaceful means. Today, when the Foreign Ministers of the States members of the Security Council are meeting here once again, I believe that such common ground is also shared by us.

The Chinese Government holds that relations between States should be based on the Five Principles of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial

(Mr. Qian Qichen, China)

integrity, mutual non-aggression, non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence; and that international disputes should be settled through dialogue and consultations. China is opposed to armed invasion and the annexation of one sovereign State by any other State under any pretext. Hence, China has from the very beginning called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Iraqi troops from Kuwait and for respect for and the restoration of Kuwait's sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and legitimate government.

China does not have, nor does it wish to seek, any self-serving interests in the Gulf region, and its only concern is to maintain peace and stability in that region. Therefore, China has made every effort to advocate a peaceful solution to the Gulf crisis. This option may take longer, but the cost would be lower and the sequelae less serious, as it were, whereas a solution through the use of force would lead to serious consequences. Once this war breaks out, all the parties concerned will suffer great losses, which will have extremely adverse effects, not only on the Gulf countries, but on world peace and stability and on the world economy as well.

The United Nations, as an international Organization for the maintenance of peace and security, is responsible both to international security and to history. It should act with great caution and avoid taking hasty action on such a major question as authorizing some Member States to take military action against another Member State. The reason why China voted in favour of the 10 resolutions on the subject adopted earlier is that, although the sanction measures as stipulated in those resolutions are severe, they are not in the domain of the use of force. However, in the draft resolution about to be voted on, the wording "use all necessary means" is used, which, in essence, permits the use of military action.

(Mr. Qian Qichen, China)

This runs counter to the consistent position of the Chinese Government, namely, to try our utmost to seek a peaceful solution. Therefore, the Chinese delegation has difficulty voting in favour of this draft resolution. On the other hand, the Gulf crisis arises as a result of the Iraqi invasion and annexation of Kuwait, and Iraq has thus far not taken any practical steps on the key question of withdrawing troops from Kuwait. In this connection, we have noted that in the draft resolution the Security Council would call on Iraq to comply fully with Security Council resolution 660 (1990) and the subsequent relevant resolutions, that is, the resolutions urging Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait immediately. Since China is in favour of this position, China will not cast a negative vote on this draft resolution either.

The Chinese Government still holds that the international community should maintain and strengthen its political, diplomatic and economic pressure on Iraq. As long as there is a gleam of hope for peace, efforts should be continued towards this end. The Chinese Government wishes once again to urge Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait immediately, and wishes that Kuwait's sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and legitimate government should be restored. The Chinese Government once again calls on the international community to use all possible opportunities and ways and means and to continue to try its best to bring about a peaceful solution to the Gulf crisis.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of China for his kind words addressed to me.

I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/21969.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: Cuba, Yemen

Abstaining: China

The PRESIDENT: The result of the voting is as follows: 12 votes in favour, 2 against, and 1 abstention. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 678 (1990).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who have asked to make statements following the voting.

Mr. DUMAS (France) (interpretation from French): For the second time this year, our Council is meeting at the exceptional level of Foreign Ministers. Once again, as on 25 September last, the issue is the crisis resulting from Iraq's aggression against Kuwait.

This underscores the seriousness with which the international community we represent views this flagrant violation of the principles on which relations between States, their independence and security are founded. It also underscores the extent to which this continuing situation, in defiance of our successive resolutions, is provocative and unacceptable.

I was pleased to see in September the Soviet Foreign Minister, Mr. Shevardnadze, presiding over our work. Today, I hail the American Secretary of State, Mr. James Baker, and should like to assure him that he will find in France the same determination to see law prevail over force.

It has now been nearly four months since Iraqi troops invaded Kuwait, where in successive exorbitant demands they have tried to impose the law of the strongest, which is rejected both by international law and by the resolve of the Kuwaiti people.

For almost four months now our Council has been endeavouring in successive resolutions to prevail upon the Iraqi authorities to restore the rule of law and to respect hallowed humanitarian principles. Ten resolutions are witness to this.

We are bound to recognize that, in the face of the international community's determination and remarkable cohesion, Iraq has shown no inclination to move towards what we rightfully expect of it.

In the wake of the recent developments in international relations, conditions have been created conducive everywhere to a new world order that respects sovereignties and identities and is also intended to promote solidarity and co-operation. Can we then tolerate such a blatant challenge for any extended

(Mr. Dumas, France)

period of time, especially in a region which is so highly sensitive, where the expectations for security and stability call for special consideration?

Everything that we have done together so far was intended to make the aggressor see reason, in other words, to bring about a peaceful settlement to the crisis with due respect for law. Since our calls have fallen on deaf ears, we are compelled to resort to a higher level of pressure in the face of the continuing challenge to the international community. This is the meaning of the resolution we have just adopted.

Its text constitutes one last invitation to implement our resolutions, coupled with a warning which itself opens the way to the use of direct means of action. It is therefore consistent with the logic of the action taken from the start in order that aggression should no longer be considered the privilege of the strong, the misfortune of the weak and the means for the acquiescence of all the others.

The text is also consistent with the logic of the attitude displayed by Iraq. If Iraq chooses to remain deaf to the appeal to reason and respect for law, that is to say remain locked into the use of force, what other choice are we left with but to resort to this same means which would appear to be the only one it recognizes?

Our objective, France's objective, is not to reach that point. We do not want to compound the troubles of a region which has already suffered from various crises over the past few decades. Nor do we intend to strike at a country and a people with which we had maintained relations of respect and friendship until quite recently. We deeply hope that Iraq's leaders will understand the meaning of our warning and accept what reason dictates. In short, we prefer a solution by a peaceful means, a peaceful settlement, and not confrontation.

(Mr. Dumas, France)

But they must entertain no doubt as to our resolve. Although my country is deeply committed to the search for a political settlement, in the final analysis law must prevail, that is to say, the attainment of the goal we have set for ourselves in our resolutions. This is in the interests of all our States; at stake is the future of relations among States in the building of a more secure and stable world.

It is in this spirit that my country voted in favour of this resolution. I should like to add the following comments again with regard to the meaning of our vote:

Assuming no adverse changes in the circumstances, my Government does not intend to introduce or to support any Security Council action to extend the scope or nature of the sanctions adopted in its resolutions 661 (1990), 665 (1990) and 670 (1990), or any new Security Council measures regarding Iraq during the period from today up to the date in paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 678 (1990), which we have just adopted.

Secondly, this undertaking is without prejudice to any and all rights of my Government under the Charter, including its rights in the event the Government of Iraq allows any harm to come to foreign nationals held against their will by that Government.

Finally, my Government recalls the provisions of paragraph 13 of Security Council resolution 670 (1990), whereby individuals are held personally responsible for grave breaches of the Fourth Geneva Convention, and states that all those involved in violations of the laws relating to armed conflict, including the prohibition against initiating the use of chemical and biological weapons contrary to the 1925 Geneva Protocol, to which Iraq is a signatory, will similarly be held personally responsible.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister of State and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. CLARK (Canada): Let me begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your presidency of this critical meeting of the Security Council.

It is just over two months since Foreign Ministers first addressed the Security Council in its consideration of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. That historic occasion, presided over by our colleague, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, was a clear sign of our collective resolve in the face of a terrible transgression of international law and a challenge to the fabric of our international order.

Today, we have gathered for a second time in this crisis - this time to adopt a resolution which demonstrates that our collective resolve is firm.

We are determined to respond to the challenge of Iraq's aggression, which goes to the heart of all that we have been trying to do at and through the United Nations for the past 45 years: our attempt to build a workable world Organization able to prevent, or to reverse, the most blatant and dangerous of international offences - the acquisition by force of another country's territory and, in this specific case, an effort to extinguish a United Nations Member in its entirety. Our purpose is not order for order's sake. It is because world order allows us to act together against the diseases that ravage children, the divisions that feed conflict and the underdevelopment that cripples countries.

(Mr. Clark, Canada)

As the Prime Minister of Canada stated in a speech before Canada's Parliament this morning,

"Canada stands with the overwhelming majority of the world community, including our partners on the Security Council, in giving Saddam Hussein an opportunity to reflect carefully on the consequences of his action and a reasonable timetable to withdraw from Kuwait. President Hussein appears to be quite prepared to see his people endure hardship indefinitely if he can hang onto Kuwait. We see no contradiction between continuing to apply pressure through economic sanctions - giving diplomacy a chance - and giving President Hussein a period of time to withdraw from Kuwait."

(spoke in French)

Today's resolution is the twelfth resolution this Council has adopted since Iraq's brutal and completely unjustifiable invasion of its smaller neighbour, the sovereign State of Kuwait, a Member in full standing of the United Nations. It is a resolution with a clear and unequivocal message, in the face of Iraq's continuing refusal to comply with the earlier resolutions adopted by this Council, that there are limits to the international community's patience. This resolution is also, however, tempered by a deeply ingrained sense of justice and the most profound desire for peace.

In this resolution, we have done more than simply reiterating our commitment to the earlier decisions we have taken. What we are saying is that, should the Government of Iraq continue to choose to ignore its obligations under international law, and under Security Council resolutions, the Member States, co-operating with the Government of Kuwait, will be authorized to use all necessary means to uphold and ensure the implementation of these resolutions. These means include the use of force.

(Mr. Clark, Canada)

(spoke in English)

Does this then mean that force will be used? That is up to Iraq. It is not yet too late to solve this peacefully, and, indeed, a peaceful solution is the desire of us all.

We have offered the Government of Iraq, in this resolution, a pause of goodwill, a period of time which we all hope it will use, not only to reflect upon the decisions of this Council, and their potential consequences, but also a period of time in which it can reverse the actions which it has taken, and the grave damage it has done to the fabric of international peace and security, a period of time in which it must release the many foreign nationals detained against their will, when it must withdraw entirely and unconditionally from Kuwait and allow its sovereignty and independence to be fully restored.

We hope Iraq will take the opportunity that this resolution offers, and by full compliance resume its place as a responsible member of the international community, on the basis of full respect for international law.

Should we also be attempting to resolve other existing tensions in the Gulf and Middle East regions? My Government believes that one of the consequences of the current Gulf crisis could be a window of opportunity to solve other problems facing a most troubled region. We have of late witnessed a pattern of successes within the Security Council in addressing regional issues. If we can sustain our collective determination, then a just, lasting and comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute, which Canada views as necessary and urgent, may be within our grasp. This is a matter that can only be addressed, however, separately from the current crisis.

Iraq's offence is sui generis and its undoing, according to the highest principles of international law, and the highest interests of international security, is essential. But resolution of all territorial disputes in the region

(Mr. Clark, Canada)

on a just and equitable basis is urgently required, if peace and security are to apply in a durable way. We will also have to turn our collective attention to the need for arms control measures, especially for weapons of mass destruction. Sustaining the new unity of the international community is the only hope and the best hope that these problems can be resolved with speed.

Many Canadians have been directly affected by this crisis, one of the most grievous the world has faced since the end of the Second World War. Canadians remain detained against their will by the Government of Iraq. Hundreds of other Canadians have joined the multinational coalition of forces in the region and are now separated by thousands of miles from their family and friends. And, despite our geographic distance, every Canadian is threatened by the new, dangerous tensions in this most volatile region of the world.

The presence of Canadian forces in the Gulf is in keeping with our traditional role as a peace-keeper under the auspices of the United Nations. To keep the peace, one must first make the peace, and it is to that cause that the Canadian men and women in the Gulf are committed. Our position has always been to uphold international law and the universally recognized norms of conduct in the relations between States.

Does Iraq have legitimate concerns which should be discussed? Perhaps there are some. It is up to the Governments of Iraq and Kuwait to negotiate those questions, either directly or in the many international forums which adjudicate exactly such disputes. The possibility of such negotiations is contained in resolution 660 (1990), the very first adopted by the Council in responding to the invasion. We urge Iraq to pursue this option. But first it must comply with the resolutions of this Council, resolutions made necessary by Iraq's deliberate

(Mr. Clark, Canada)

decision to abandon the search for peaceful solutions and to invade Kuwait and seek to destroy it as a sovereign State. We sincerely hope Iraq will comply with these resolutions, as all of us wish to see peace instead of war.

That choice, between peace and war, is now in the hands of Iraq.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. ABU HASSAN (Malaysia): Mr. President, I should like to join others in extending our felicitations to you for presiding over the Council at a time when the United States holds the presidency. With your experience and stature, I am sure you will guide these important deliberations of the Council to the desired end.

It has come to pass, finally, that the Security Council has adopted a resolution to present Iraq, in clear terms, with the choice within a specific time frame to comply with the relevant resolutions or face the certainty of force authorized by the Council. For Malaysia, this is an extremely tragic turn of events. Malaysia has laboured over each of the 10 resolutions adopted by the Council and insisted on the need to project a balanced signal to Iraq: the necessity of complying with the resolutions and that the diplomatic option is always open. Even with the present resolution, the most serious in the history of the Council, it is Malaysia's hope that force does not have to be inevitable, that there is yet time for Iraq to comply and that the region can still be spared from war.

Malaysia has just now had to discharge an awesome responsibility as a member of the Council. Malaysia prays to the Almighty Allah that we have taken the right decision, that in the final analysis, in discharging our responsibilities, we are underlining the determination of the international community to check aggression and restore Kuwait.

(Mr. Abu Hassan, Malaysia)

It has not been an easy decision for Malaysia. We carefully considered all the various factors before arriving at our decision to support the resolution. We also listened closely to our friends from the Arab region and those who have exchanged counsel with us. We have particularly taken heed of the desperate pleas of Kuwait, a small country whose sufferings have weighed heavily on our judgement.

The natural tendency would be to abstain, horrified at the prospects of war and the thousands who would perish; however, we are convinced that such a step on our part would not amount to effectively discharging our responsibilities in the Council.

As a small nation and a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and of the Non-Aligned Movement, it is Malaysia's duty to support and uphold the unity and resolve of the Council to reverse aggression and to restore peace. Malaysia's stand against strong nations invading or annexing small nations is well known. This applies not only to Iraq but to all others, without exception. We cannot compromise on this if we are, together, to build strong foundations for a new world order.

(Mr. Abu Hassan, Malaysia)

We have also asked ourselves whether the Council has given sufficient time for sanctions to have had the necessary impact. Again, the natural inclination, to avoid the use of force, would have been to allow more time for sanctions. But the Council is faced with the reality that it will be months and months before it can be deduced that sanctions have had effects. In the meantime, Iraq has shown no indication of complying with the resolutions. In the meantime, too, the destruction of Kuwait continues, as well as the perpetration of atrocities on Kuwait's people. Also, several thousand foreigners remain as hostages.

Malaysia would like to make it clear that our support for resolution 678 (1990) is not without reservations. The authorization of force, in the eventuality that Iraq still does not comply within the time frame specified, can only be taken under the terms of the Charter of the United Nations. We have not agreed to any attempt unilaterally to apply Article 51 of the Charter once the Security Council is seized of the matter. In this regard, we have always insisted on the centrality of the United Nations role in the maintenance of international peace and security. Any proposed use of force must be brought before the Council for its prior approval, in accordance with the specific provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. We regret that this point is not clearly reflected in this resolution, a precedent that may not bode well for the future. When the United Nations Security Council provides the authorization for countries to use force, these countries are fully accountable for their actions to the Council through a clear system of reporting and accountability, which is not adequately covered in resolution 678 (1990).

It must be underlined that this resolution does not provide a blank cheque for excessive and indiscriminate use of force. The Council has certainly not authorized actions outside the context of its resolutions 660 (1990), 662 (1990)

(Mr. Abu Hassan, Malaysia)

and 664 (1990). Malaysia warns against any action purportedly taken under this resolution that would lead to the virtual destruction of Iraq. We remain conscious of the untold misery that war will inflict on the countries and the people in the region. The Middle East, already a flash-point of conflict, due primarily to Israeli aggression and occupation of Palestinian and Arab lands, cannot afford any more turmoil. History has taught us that it is easy to start a war, but ending it is often messy and, in many recent cases, inconclusive.

As Foreign Minister of Malaysia, and on this International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People, I am obliged to express my deep disappointment with the Council over its inability for more than three weeks now to address properly the question of Palestinians in the occupied territories, arising from the report of the Secretary-General. All attempts to bring about a proper consideration of this matter, including a vote, have been deliberately thwarted, raising questions on the procedure and conduct of the Council. Malaysia will not allow the Palestinian issue to be shunted aside on the basis of the political expediencies of certain countries. Those countries which make such attempts must be clearly reminded by other members of the Council, who must raise their voices, in fairness, if the Council is to maintain its credibility for being even-handed. For our part, the Malaysian people, who are unswerving in their support of the Palestinian cause, will not understand inconsistencies and contradictions of this nature.

It is absurd to talk of linkages, but every action of the Council stands evaluated, one against the other. On the basis of the performance of the Council over this period, the Council can easily be labelled as doing disservice to the Palestinian cause.

Malaysia would like to urge Iraq to weigh clearly the import of the resolution that the Council has adopted. There is a period given, as a pause of goodwill, for

(Mr. Abu Hassan, Malaysia)

Iraq to take stock of the whole situation. Iraq can still prevent the use of force and the outbreak of war. There is no dishonour in responding to the appeals of the international community. Steps taken by Iraq to comply with the relevant resolutions would enhance important prospects for a peace framework that would fully address issues between Iraq and Kuwait and bring about an early removal of foreign forces from the region, as well as allow for a positive consideration of the wider questions of peace and security in the region. Efforts along these lines being pursued by Colombia have Malaysia's support. We feel that such a framework can become a logical complement to resolution 678 (1990), facilitating, it is to be hoped, Iraqi compliance. There are many Members of the United Nations that, horrified by the prospects of war, would like the Security Council seriously to consider such an initiative.

In conclusion, Malaysia, as a member of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the Non-Aligned Movement, would like to implore Iraq, for the sake of peace, to comply with the resolutions adopted by the Security Council. The onus for the avoidance of the use of force is clearly on Iraq.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Malaysia for his kind words.

I now call on the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Mr. HURD (United Kingdom): I would like, first, to thank and congratulate you, Sir, for the strenuous efforts which you and others have made during the United States presidency to sustain and carry forward the objectives of the Council.

We are gathered here, it seems to me, to make a strong bid for peace. That is the purpose of this meeting. No State represented on the Council has any seat for

(Mr. Hurd, United Kingdom)

war. Certainly, we in Britain know well the suffering and destruction which war in the Gulf would be likely to cause. It must be right to go the last mile in search of peace, and that is what this resolution does. We have put into place today the latest and, I think, the strongest of the peaceful pressures on Iraq.

The international community, as represented by this Council, has been clear from the beginning about the nature of Iraq's action against Kuwait. Indeed, Iraq made only a fleeting and wholly futile attempt to justify the aggression. So we have not seen here that flow of argument and counter-argument or the complicated tangle of historical background which, in other cases, has made it difficult for the Security Council to make or persevere in a clear response. There have been many acts of international injustice since 1945, and it is perfectly true that too many of those acts still persist. That is beyond doubt.

(Mr. Hurd, United Kingdom)

But in a world composed of nation States, and in an organization like the United Nations, which consists wholly of nation States, the obliteration of one Member State by another is an act on its own. It undermines and threatens the whole structure of international order. And that is not an abstract concept. By undermining and threatening the structure of international order, an act of aggression of this kind threatens the safety of all our citizens.

So the response of the international community has been swift and severe, but also peaceful. Nearly four months have passed since the aggression. Sanctions are in place and have been convincingly applied. If he were to base himself solely on reading the resolutions of the Security Council and the list of those who supported them the President of Iraq would have a clear and accurate account of the reactions of the international community.

But, of course, in the world today communication is confused. We live in the world of the soundbite, of brilliantly organized mass media pouring out, hour by hour, a mass of incomplete reports, impressions and speculation. By a selective reading of this output the President of Iraq might gain a quite different impression - an impression of divisions and of irresolution. A number of individuals, including people from my country - usually with good intentions - have, by their visits to Baghdad or their efforts elsewhere, contributed to this blurring of perceptions. We see it as one of the main purposes of this resolution to blow away the uncertainties and set out for the Iraqis exactly how they stand and how we stand.

There is no ambiguity about what the Council requires in this resolution and in previous resolutions. We require that Iraq comply fully with the terms of resolution 660 (1990) and all later resolutions and withdraw all its forces unconditionally to the positions on which they stood on 1 August. This means that withdrawal must be complete. If not, then Member States, acting with the

(Mr. Hurd, United Kingdom)

Government of Kuwait, are authorized to use such force as may be necessary to compel compliance.

From now on, until the date of expiry of the deadline, unless there should be an adverse change in circumstances, we do not intend to introduce or to support any Security Council action to extend the scope or nature of the sanctions under Security Council resolutions 661 (1990), 665 (1990) or 670 (1990) or any new measures in the Security Council regarding Iraq. As my colleague from France, Mr. Roland Dumas, said in respect of his Government, this is without prejudice to the rights of my Government under the Charter should the Government of Iraq allow any harm to come to foreign nationals whom it is holding against their will.

I should also like to recall the terms of paragraph 13 of resolution 670 (1990), under which individuals are held personally responsible for grave breaches of the Geneva Convention. We should also hold personally responsible those involved in violations of the laws of armed conflict, including the prohibition against initiating the use of chemicals or biological weapons contrary to the Geneva Protocol of 1925, to which Iraq is a party.

In conclusion, I want to say that, following the adoption of this resolution, there is an option for peace, and the Iraqis hold it in their hands. It is for them to use that option or to discard it. The international community has not added today to its demands. It is not asking for anything except the reversal of the aggression - namely, full compliance with previous resolutions. But that reversal and that compliance the international community intends to obtain. The Iraqis now have a further period of grace in which to respond. By 15 January - the date in this resolution - the aggression will be nearly six months old. So will the suffering of Kuwait and of most of our hostages. No one can accuse the Council of impatience. The military option is reality, not bluff; if it has to be used, it will be used with the full backing of the Council. Now that the facts are plain

(Mr. Hurd, United Kingdom)

and clear, the Iraqis, it seems to me, have the strongest possible incentive, of all kinds, to choose the peaceful course. Let us hope and pray they will do so.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. PAASIQ (Finland): Let me, first, thank you, Mr. President, for the invitation extended to me and to my colleagues from the other States members of the Security Council to attend this meeting at the ministerial level. We are grateful for the opportunity to meet today under your distinguished leadership.

The invasion of Kuwait by Iraq has created a situation of unprecedented danger. Iraqi aggression imperils the very existence of a sovereign State Member of this Organisation. It has created human suffering on a vast scale. It directly challenges the system of collective security that exists under the Charter. That is why Finland is engaged. That is why the Ministers are here, for the second time. Collective security means that the security of Kuwait is also the security of all other States, particularly of the smaller ones. The foundations of our own security are at stake.

The world community has shown determination in the face of the unprovoked aggression by Iraq against Kuwait. The occupation will not be allowed to stand. But the world has also shown plenty of patience.

What the Security Council demands of Iraq has been clearly and openly stated on many occasions. The principal demands are: full and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from the territory of Kuwait, leading to the restoration of Kuwaiti sovereignty, and the release of all foreign nationals under Iraqi control held against their will.

Throughout the course of these events the Security Council has taken action as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. The sanctions

(Mr. Paasio, Finland)

mandated four months ago remain the principal instrument intended to demonstrate to the Iraqi leadership the need to change course.

According to the Charter, should the Security Council consider that the economic and diplomatic measures have proved to be inadequate it may take further action as may be necessary to restore international peace and security. Acting under these provisions, the Council is simply giving effect to what is the core of the United Nations system of collective security. The authority of the Security Council must be upheld.

During the past 40 years the circumstances in which the Charter was drafted and the central purposes it was intended to serve may sometimes have been forgotten. We are now confronted with a situation in which one Member State claims the right to obliterate another Member State. Such an act is precisely the kind of aggression that the drafters of the Charter intended to prevent and, if necessary, suppress.

Everything the Council does today is intended to show that a peaceful settlement is possible. Throughout this crisis Finland has worked for a peaceful outcome. The resolution adopted today should be regarded as a warning. There are no plans to extend in the coming period, until the date mentioned in the resolution, the scope of the sanctions already in force. These weeks should be fully utilized in order to achieve a peaceful way out of the crisis. We are waiting for Iraq to respond to our message of peace and to give, in return, a message leading to reconciliation with the world community. The good offices of the Secretary-General are available in this regard.

It is very late, but it is not yet too late for Iraq to do what is necessary for the achievement of a peaceful solution to the crisis created by its own use of force against Kuwait.

Mr. ESSY (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): First, Sir, I should like to say how very pleased my delegation is to see you presiding over this historic Security Council meeting at the ministerial level. You represent a country with which Côte d'Ivoire is linked by warm relations of friendship and close co-operation.

I take this opportunity also to express to Sir David Hannay, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, our appreciation of the fruitful contribution he made to the work of the Security Council during the month of October.

The Council has today adopted its twelfth resolution since 2 August on the agenda item "The situation between Iraq and Kuwait". Côte d'Ivoire supported all those resolutions, thereby demonstrating its refusal to accept the primacy of force over law and justice in international relations.

In this connection the Ninth Congress of the Democratic Party of Côte d'Ivoire, which was held at Yamoussoukro from 1 to 5 October, addressed the issue of the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. In the resolution unanimously adopted on that subject the Congress,

"Recalling the aims and principles of the foreign policy of Côte d'Ivoire, based on the search for peace among nations, non-interference in the internal affairs of States and rejection of recourse to the threat or use of force against either the territorial integrity or the political independence of any State, condemned the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq and endorsed the resolutions adopted by the Security Council calling upon Iraq to put an end to its occupation of Kuwait."

My country remains firmly dedicated to peace and in all circumstances prefers peaceful means for the settlement of conflicts or differences, whatever their origin, gravity or complexity - the means, that is, of dialogue and negotiation.

(Mr. Essy, Côte d'Ivoire)

Our attitude to this conflict has always been based solely on the logic of peace. Iraq, a member, like Kuwait, of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, is apparently not fully weighing the disastrous consequences of its act, which of course penalizes all nations, but most especially the very great majority of that Movement's members whose economies are being disrupted by the collapse of commodity prices and the explosion in the price of petroleum products. This, alas, threatens to destroy several years of effort aimed at the structural adjustment and new investments that are indispensable to the health of their economies.

The resolution adopted today is a logical outcome of Iraq's non-compliance with the resolutions adopted earlier by the Council, especially resolution 660 (1990). It should, in our view, maintain and ensure the renewal of the credibility of our Organization and the hope it is now inspiring.

The Iraqi leaders, who excel in the art of political manipulation via the media and are toying with human lives as if engaged in a game of chess, will not attain their objective of leading the international community to accept out of weariness a situation entailing the occupation, subjugation and destruction of an independent State Member of the United Nations. The international community cannot allow a dangerous precedent to be set that would create serious threats to peace for the great majority of the small States that today make up the United Nations and for which the Charter is the best shield in the preservation of their sovereignty and integrity.

Kuwait will live, and we hope that Iraq will think again and take to heart the maxim according to which blood should never be shed in a dispute that can be settled according to the law.

It is now for Iraq to view events in the light of the old Akan proverb of my country: "It is useless to violate the rights of others in the interest of one's own rights, for that way lies only disappointment."

(Mr. Essy, Côte d'Ivoire)

At a time like the present, when the emphasis is on the quest for peace and solidarity among States, on development and the protection of the human environment, and when the United Nations is working more zealously than ever before to achieve those goals, the international community cannot allow aggression such as that committed by Iraq against a small neighbouring country to darken the horizon of its hopes and thwart its efforts to establish peace and harmony, whether regional or global. We therefore hope that the resolution which the Council has just adopted will be perceived by Iraq's leaders as a reflection of the international community's determination to ensure respect, by all necessary means, for the great purposes and principles of the Charter. It is, of course, our firm hope that Iraq's leaders will rise above their immediate ambitions and realize that the interests of their own country, their people, require that they end their aggression. Above all, we hope - and this is the most sincere wish of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire - that the ultimate goal of the resolution we have just adopted is, according to the well-known adage, to know how to show one's strength in order not to have to use it.

Thus, the last appeal that our Council is addressing to Iraq is to respond positively and without delay to the expectations of the international community. We do not seek its humiliation. We demand only that it comply with international law.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Côte d'Ivoire for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. SHEVARDNADZE (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I think it is both logical and symbolic that this meeting of the Security Council is being presided over by Mr. James Baker, the Secretary of State of the United States, the country which from the very beginning of the Persian Gulf crisis has played an active role in countering aggression.

(Mr. Shevardnadze, USSR)

There is logic in the actions of our Council, which, from the outset of the crisis, has acted with cohesion and consistency and, at the same time, in a responsible, calm and prudent manner, in strict conformity with the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter in its modern interpretation, which restores its original rights and authority. We have been faced with the first extremely grave test of the post-cold-war period, and we are coping with it, placing mankind's common interests at the centre of our policy and being guided by the principles of the new thinking in international affairs.

There is justice and a large measure of generosity in the resolution we have just adopted. As the end of the fourth month of the crisis approaches, the international community is showing genuine magnanimity and giving the side that has breached the peace time to think again. At the same time we are giving the victim in this crisis a firm pledge that it will not have to wait much longer, that help is on the way and that its rights will be fully restored.

Today we have started the count-down of the "pause of goodwill". We are confident that before the time is up events will take a turn towards peace and that the pause will usher in a transition to a political settlement.

(Mr. Shevardnadze, USSR)

Had we thought otherwise, this resolution would have been unnecessary. It is one last sincere attempt to give common sense a chance to prevail; or, let us say, to give the instinct of self-preservation a chance to work; to give Iraq time to think about the consequences of any other than peaceful outcome of the crisis.

So we want to begin the pause of goodwill by calling upon Iraq and President Saddam Hussein to rise above considerations of prestige, to display wisdom and foresight and to place above all else the interests of the country and the fate of its people and of peace and stability on our planet.

No member of the Council wants or seeks a tragic outcome; but nor should there be any mistake about the collective will of the international community as expressed here, or about its resolve and its readiness to act. The Council's action is based on the clear awareness and belief that shirking its duty now by failing to reverse the aggression would mean even greater hardship and suffering for the world and for all nations. Those who have breached the peace should know that "all necessary means" will indeed inexorably be used against them. All of us would be happy if only there were no need to resort to such means.

Let me say frankly that today's decision was not an easy one for the Soviet Union. Everyone knows of our long-standing ties with Iraq and our good feelings towards the people of that country. But it is precisely our genuine concern for the future of millions of Iraqis that motivates us, together with our concern for the world in which all of us have to live.

We have just emerged from the dark shadow of confrontation, which so often served as a cover for unlawful and arbitrary actions. We must put all that behind us and rule it out for the future.

(Mr. Shevardnadze, USSR)

We have just begun to overcome the mutual animosity, suspicion and estrangement that generated tension and conflict. Again, we must put it behind us and no longer be weighed down by that burdensome legacy.

We have just become aware of the universal value of freedom and democracy for man, for society and for international relations. They must be protected and upheld. Only on the basis of those values can we build and affirm a new, just world order and move towards equitable, mutually respectful and mutually beneficial relations among States and peoples.

I say quite bluntly that what has happened in the Persian Gulf region strikes a blow at the emerging world of civilized behaviour. That is why it is so important to parry that blow and make sure that it does not do irreparable damage to the institutions of peace and democracy, thereby plunging the world into chaos. The world will not enter a more lucid, calm and stable phase unless it can meet the residual challenges of the past and rise to the new challenges of the present and the future.

It is of overriding importance that today we are no longer responding to these challenges in the same way as we did yesterday. We are giving preference to the law, to action under the authority of the Charter and of the Security Council, and to collective efforts. We have acted thus, collectively and in concert, throughout the long and difficult weeks of the Persian Gulf crisis, and we are continuing to do so. We are right to act in this way. I see it as a sign that we are truly entering a time of political maturity and have recognized that freedom and democracy are inseparable from an awareness by each one of us of our responsibility for order, for the state of our common home and for saving world civilization.

I have to say that, while it in no way minimizes our sympathy for Kuwait or our pain at its suffering, there is more at stake than the fate of that one State.

(Mr. Shevardnadze, USSR)

Our common future is threatened. Hence the certainty that Kuwait will be reborn as an independent and sovereign State, as demanded by the resolutions adopted by the Security Council.

As some of my colleagues have rightly noted, we do not favour linkages in politics, least of all such absurd ones as those that seem to require the creation of a new problem in order to solve an old one, or the enslavement of one nation in order to promote the freedom of another. That would be truly absurd. But nor do we see any logic in artificially holding back efforts to solve a long-standing problem just because of the emergence of a new one that has to be addressed first.

The international community and the United Nations have been trying for many years to deal with the problems of a Middle East settlement and of resolving the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinian question - unfortunately, without much success so far. We were involved with this problem before the events of 2 August. Our efforts took various forms. Consultations were held; various approaches were explored; there were discussions of the possibility of setting up security structures in the region, implementing security-building measures, and many other things. Wide-ranging dialogue on all these matters has long been a part of exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States at various levels.

Why should we stop all this now? Are we in some strange way intimidated by the word "linkage"? We believe that we should continue what we have been doing and what we ought to be doing now: seeking a path towards a comprehensive settlement of the whole complex of Middle East problems that existed prior to 2 August. That is not rewarding anyone; it is just sound policy and common sense.

(Mr. Shevardnadze, USSR)

The Soviet Union is prepared to develop further its contacts with all the parties concerned in seeking a settlement of the Middle East conflict. In this context we have been co-operating actively with Arab countries and the Palestinians. We are ready to engage in dialogue, in any form and at any level, with Israel. We find the approaches of European countries interesting. And of course consultations among the permanent members of the Security Council on issues related to a Middle East settlement have a very special role to play.

Our clear and straightforward position on the Persian Gulf crisis enables us to work in that direction without being deterred by hints or accusations of somehow linking this crisis with the problem of an Arab-Israeli settlement. Let us not talk ourselves into believing in what does not and cannot exist.

The purpose of the resolution we have just adopted is to put an end to the aggression and make it clear to the world that aggression cannot be rewarded. We hope the Iraqi leaders will find the strength to recognize the responsibility they bear to their own people and to history and comply with the will of the international community. We are serving them with a special warning about their personal responsibility for the fate of foreign nationals in Iraq. Endangering their lives will be regarded as a crime against humanity, with all the consequences that entails.

(Mr. Shevardnadze, USSR)

On behalf of the Soviet Union, I would like to state that in accordance with the support given by my Government to the concept of the "pause of goodwill" referred to in the resolution adopted today and for its duration, we will be guided by the following precepts, to which some of my colleagues have already referred.

First, assuming that there have been no adverse changes in the circumstances, my Government does not intend to introduce or to support any Security Council action to extend the scope or nature of the sanctions under Security Council resolutions 661 (1990), 665 (1990) or 670 (1990), or any new measures of the Security Council regarding Iraq during the period between now and the date indicated in operative paragraph 2 of Security Council resolution 678 (1990).

Secondly, that undertaking is without prejudice to any and all rights of my Government under the Charter, including its rights should the Government of Iraq allow any harm to come to foreign nationals held against their will by the Government of Iraq.

Thirdly, my Government recalls the terms of operative paragraph 13 of Security Council resolution 670 (1990) under which individuals are held personally responsible for grave breaches of the Fourth Geneva Convention, and states that all those involved in violations of the laws of armed conflict, including the prohibition against initiating the use of chemical or biological weapons contrary to the Geneva Protocol of 1925, to which Iraq is a signatory, will similarly be held personally responsible.

In conclusion, I express the confidence that we will be able to overcome this crisis peacefully - I repeat, peacefully, and in a political way - and to end it on a note of hope for a better future for all of us.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. NASTASE (Romania): You are presiding, Sir, over a historic meeting of the Security Council. Your statesmanship and experience in world affairs, as a representative of a country that has an important and responsible role to play in maintaining international peace and security, are significant guarantees for the success of our proceedings.

I would also like to take the opportunity to pay a tribute to Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, Secretary-General of the United Nations, for his constant efforts and valuable contribution to enhancing the role of the world Organization in the peaceful settlement of the Gulf crisis.

Two months ago, I had occasion to reiterate before the Council the position of Romania on the agenda item entitled "The situation between Iraq and Kuwait". We continue to believe that every effort should be made to ease the existing tension politically and to solve the issues at stake by peaceful means, in accordance with the resolutions of the Security Council.

The most appropriate framework in that regard is the United Nations. Consequently, all efforts should be directed towards making full use of the potential of the Charter and the resources offered by it. We are thinking in particular of the capabilities of the Security Council and of the good offices and other initiatives that may be undertaken by the Secretary-General. We should be inspired and encouraged by past experience in the Council, when the solidarity and common will of its members made possible the adoption of effective measures. Such a consensus has been achieved only through patience and wisdom, sometimes with considerable effort. Today, those requirements are more pressing than ever before.

Indeed, the persistence of the present situation in the Gulf is conducive to new dangers, even to a catastrophe in the area, with unpredictable consequences for world peace and security, as well as for the world economy. It is absolutely certain that the maintenance of the current situation in the area is seriously

(Mr. Nastase, Romania)

affecting the whole international community. Many countries, including Romania, are confronted with tremendous difficulties in the economic and social fields as a consequence of the implementation of resolutions imposing economic sanctions on Iraq. In fact, the stability of the entire energy situation in the world is imperilled.

Such a course of events challenges the credibility of the United Nations and of the Security Council in particular. The Council should prove its capacity to ensure the implementation of and respect for its own decisions. At the same time, the Council should prove its real efficiency as a body dedicated to the peaceful settlement of conflicts.

As members of the Council, we find ourselves facing a delicate challenge. On the one hand, there is no doubt that the decisions of the Security Council should be fully respected and implemented; on the other, all chances to achieve a political settlement of the crisis should be explored and used.

This is not the first time that the international community has faced difficult choices. We should always learn from the lessons of the past. The present situation in the Gulf is a clear reminder to us of the test Romania had to undergo when an illustrious Romanian diplomat of the inter-war period, Foreign Minister Nicolae Titulescu, advocated a dramatic decision against a friendly country that had committed an aggression against another State. It was a case referred to by Secretary of State James Baker in his opening remarks. The legal obligation had to prevail over any other consideration. As Titulescu put it in that particular case, similar to the one under consideration:

"The line of Romania's policy was a straight one, but it was the straight line of the bullet that penetrates the heart before hitting its target."

(Mr. Nastase, Romania)

Indeed, we have had to make a difficult decision today. We did make it, however, on the basis of our conviction that the sovereign and independent existence of our nations implies international service to peace. It is that service that motivated our action today in the Council.

Consequently, we had to arrive at the logical conclusion that the Security Council should use all the means at its disposal, including those provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression.

We express the hope that the resolution just adopted and the statements made here will be responsibly interpreted by all concerned, who will finally prove to have the necessary political wisdom. It is not too late to listen to the voice of reason and to choose a dignified course of action leading to the full restoration of peace and legal order in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. We are confident that peace can and should be made secure in the area and to that end we must use all our force of conviction and resort to every peaceful means available.

May this historic meeting of the Security Council serve that purpose and be a landmark in our common endeavours to promote the development of a peaceful and rational order based on the universal legal norms and values cherished by the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania for the kind words he addressed to me.

I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as Secretary of State of the United States of America.

I think that today's vote marks a watershed in the history of the United Nations.

Earlier this week members of the Security Council heard testimony of crimes committed against the citizens of Kuwait. There can be no doubt that these are crimes incompatible with any civilized order. They are part of the same pattern that includes - and many speakers have referred to this today - the taking of innocent hostages from many nations.

The entire international community has been affronted by a series of brutal acts. Iraqi forces have invaded and seized a small Arab neighbour. A once-prosperous country has been pillaged and looted. A once-peaceful country has been turned into an armed camp. A once-secure country has been terrorized.

The nations of the world have not stood idly by. We have taken political, economic and military measures to quarantine Iraq and contain its aggression. We have worked out a co-ordinated international effort involving over 50 States to provide assistance to those nations most in need as a consequence of the economic embargo of Iraq. And military forces from over 27 nations have been deployed to defend Iraq's neighbours from further aggression and to implement the resolutions of this Council. The 12 resolutions adopted by the Council have clearly established that there is a peaceful way out of this conflict - and that is the complete, immediate and unconditional Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, the restoration of Kuwait's legitimate Government and the release of all hostages.

(The President)

I do not think all this could have taken place unless most nations shared our vision of what is at stake. A dangerous man committed a blatant act of aggression in a vital region at a very critical moment in history. Saddam Hussein's actions, the vast arms he possesses and the weapons of mass destruction he seeks indicate clearly that Kuwait was not only not the first but probably not the last target on his list. If he should win this struggle, then there will be no peace in the Middle East: only the prospect of more conflict and a far wider war. If he should come to dominate the resources of the Gulf, his ambitions will threaten all of us here and the economic well-being of all nations. Finally, if Iraq should emerge from this conflict with territory or with treasure or with political advantage, then the lesson will be very, very clear: aggression pays.

As I said earlier today, we must remember the lesson of the 1930s and aggression must not be rewarded. Since 2 August many nations have worked together to prove just that. Many unprecedented actions have been taken. The result is a new fact: a newly effective United Nations Security Council, free of the constraints of the cold war. Yet the sad truth is that the new fact has not yet erased the old fact of Iraqi aggression, and that - and that alone - is the ultimate test of success.

We must ask ourselves why Saddam has not recoiled from his aggression. We must wonder why he does not understand how great the forces are against him and how profound is the revulsion against his behaviour. The answer must be that he does not believe we really mean what we say. He does not believe we will stand united until he withdraws. He thinks that his fact of aggression is going to outlast our fact: that is, an international community opposed to aggression.

We are meeting here today, therefore, first and foremost - as many speakers here have already pointed out - to dispel Saddam Hussein's illusions. He must know

(The President)

from us that a refusal to comply peacefully with the Security Council resolutions risks disaster for him.

Fellow members of the Security Council, we are at a crossroads. Today we show Saddam Hussein that the sign marked "peace" is the direction he should take.

Today's resolution is very clear. The words authorize the use of force. But the purpose, I believe - and, again, many here have already said this - is to bring about a peaceful resolution of this problem. No one here has sought this conflict. Many nations here have had very good relations with the people of Iraq. But the Security Council of the United Nations cannot tolerate this aggression and still be faithful to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

With the adoption of today's resolution we concur with other Council members that this should lead to a pause in the Council's efforts - assuming, of course, no adverse change in circumstances. We do so while retaining our rights, as other nations have, to protect our foreign nationals in Iraq, and very mindful of the terms of the Fourth Geneva Convention and the Geneva Protocol of 1925, should Saddam Hussein use chemical or biological weapons.

By adopting today's resolution, which we think is a pause for peace, we say to Saddam Hussein: "We continue to seek a diplomatic solution. Peace is your only sensible option. You can choose peace by respecting the will of the international community. But if you fail to do so, you will risk all. The choice is yours."

If we fail to redress this aggression, more will be lost than just peace in the Persian Gulf. Only recently, in Europe, the nations party to the cold war assembled to bury that conflict. All the peoples of Europe and North America who had nothing to look forward to except an unending twilight struggle now have a fresh start, indeed a new opportunity. Conflict and war are no longer the watchwords of European politics.

(The President)

We meet at the hinge of history. We can use the end of the cold war to get beyond the whole pattern of settling conflicts by force, or we can slip back into ever more savage regional conflicts in which might alone makes right. We can take the high road towards peace and the rule of law, or we can take Saddam Hussein's path of brutal aggression and the law of the jungle. Simply put, it is a choice between right and wrong. I think we have the courage and the fortitude to choose what is right.

Resuming my function as President of the Council, I now call on the Secretary-General.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The Security Council has taken a decision of immense portent. I should like to stress that, even on the most stringent reading, the resolution just adopted envisages at least 45 days of earnest effort to achieve a peaceful solution of the crisis. Mindful of the responsibility inherent in my office, I must express the hope that this time will be used to the most constructive purpose.

In my statement at the Council's ministerial meeting on 25 September I sought to point out the position of principle deriving from the Charter that is involved in this question. In requiring compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council, the United Nations seeks not surrender but the most honourable way of resolving a crisis in a manner that respects all legitimate interests and is conducive to the wider peace and the rule of law.

This, it is necessary to emphasize, is not a matter simply of rhetoric. It is not a question of clothing a bellicose intent in persuasive language. To my mind, the situation requires that diplomatic efforts be made with renewed determination to put the present crisis on the road to a peaceful outcome.

A collective engagement, as I have observed before, requires a discipline all its own. Moreover, the actions of the United Nations to correct this international wrong must be perceived as part of the larger endeavour to establish peace through justice, wherever the one is imperilled and the other denied.

The PRESIDENT: The Deputy Premier and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

Sheikh AL SABAH (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): In my opening statement today, I said that the people of Kuwait were looking to the Council to help them return to their homeland and restore their freedom and the ability to exercise their natural rights in their own country. We came here seeking the Council's support in defeating aggression and eliminating the injustices and ending the crimes committed on our land. I said that the Council was the voice of mankind, mankind which cries for justice, and that your voice is the echo of the conscience that yearns for fairness on the basis of the rule of law.

May I express to every member of the Council deep gratitude on behalf of the people of Kuwait, whose hopes the Council has now reinforced, while strengthening their resolve and determination to extract hope from painful suffering and a momentum for constructive work from hardship. The Council's collective position in the face of the Iraqi crime in Kuwait is a real lesson to anyone who might be misled by his own might to invade the land of others and to anyone who might be deceived into reliance on brute, naked force to achieve his greedy designs, for the resolution sends a strong, unequivocal and unmistakable message to the whole world that aggression will be reversed and that the era of the use of force has come to an end once and for all.

In the name of all Kuwaitis, who have become the victims of torture, occupation, deprivation and homelessness, I thank all members of the Council for the resolve they have shown today by adopting yet another resolution in the face of aggression. At the same time, I am spelling out their hope of returning to their homeland without any further destruction, their hope that sanity and reason will prevail once the Iraqi régime carefully and soberly ponders the full meaning and significance of the new facts that have emerged today and responds to the Council's calls and appeals.

(Sheikh Al Sabah, Kuwait)

I shall return to the people of Kuwait and faithfully convey to them what I have just seen and heard - the Council's views and sentiments and the outcome of its deliberations. Quite soon, Kuwaitis will once again see a promising future, because today the Council has handed down its judgement that an era of darkness is doomed.

Once again, I wish to express our thanks and gratitude to all the members of the Council. I say to them: "May God bring peace to all of you."

The PRESIDENT: There are no other speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.



Security Council

PROVIS^{ON}AL

S/PV.2964
30 November 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 30 November 1990, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Mr. PICKERING

(United States of America)

Members: Canada
China
Colombia
Côte d'Ivoire
Cuba
Ethiopia
Finland
France
Malaysia
Romania
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland
Yemen
Zaire

Mr. FORTIER
Mr. JIN Yongjian
Mrs. CASTAÑO
Mr. ANET
Mr. MORENO FERNANDEZ
Mr. HAGOSS
Mr. TÖRNUDD
Mr. ROCHEREAU DE LA SABLIERE
Mr. REDZUAN
Mr. FLOREAN
Mr. VORONTSOV

Sir David HANNAY
Mr. AL-ASHTAL
Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 11.50 a.m.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: Before we proceed to the adoption of the agenda, let me say that it is a welcome sight to see you all back safely in your seats again. In comparative terms, I am a little disappointed with the audience we have today. However, I suspect we will proceed no less rigorously with the business at hand.

I would like to thank you all as well for your co-operation with the President yesterday, who asked me particularly to pass that thanks on to you and to your Ministers.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS DISENGAGEMENT OBSERVER FORCE (S/21950 and Corr.1)

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force for the period 22 May 1990 to 23 November 1990, in document S/21950 and Corr.1. Members of the Council also have before them a draft resolution, contained in document S/21972, which has been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has thus been adopted unanimously as resolution 679 (1990).

In connection with the resolution just adopted on the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force, I have been authorized to make the following complementary statement on behalf of the Security Council:

"As is known, the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (S/21950 and Corr.1) states, in paragraph 23:

'Despite the present quiet in the Israel-Syria sector, the situation in the Middle East as a whole continues to be potentially dangerous and is likely to remain so, unless and until a comprehensive settlement covering all aspects of the Middle East problem can be reached.'

"That statement of the Secretary-General reflects the view of the Security Council."

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.